DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 750 UD 015 284

AUTHOR Dietrich, Katheryn; Greiser, Lee
TITLE Residence Differences in Characteristics of Black, Lower-Class Families. Departmental Information Report No. 74-10.
INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
REPORT NO DIR-74-10
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 97p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Demography; Family Attitudes; *Family Characteristics; Family Relationship; Family Structure; *Geographic Location; *Low Income; *Negroes; Occupational Surveys; Poverty Research; Rural Urban Differences; Social Relations; Socioeconomic Status; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

The research reported here examines residence differences (metropolitan ghetto, non metropolitan, or rural) in characteristics purportedly associated with poverty among poor, black Americans--and particularly in family relationships and interaction. Samples, drawn from the eastern part of Texas, were restricted to families with children still in the home. Residence differences were searched for in education and occupations, aspects of family structure and interaction, interaction of the homemakers and husbands with persons and groups outside of their nuclear families, and aspirations and expectations of the black homemakers. Highlights of the findings of the study, as stated, include the following: (1) stable and healthy family relationships, as reflected by the variables of father-absence, the husband-father role in the family, family cohesiveness and marital satisfaction may be more difficult to maintain by poor blacks of metropolitan ghettos than nonmetropolitan areas; (2) future orientations appear more prohibitive of intra-generational mobility among nonmetropolitan than metropolitan poor blacks; and, (3) nonmetropolitan poor blacks might be more handicapped than metropolitan poor blacks by demands of kin relationships, larger families, the nature of their child-rearing practices, and their goals for their children. (Author/JM)

ED107750

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DEPARTMENTAL INFORMATION REPORT NUMBER 74-10

RESIDENCE DIFFERENCES IN CHARACTERISTICS OF BLACK, LOWER-CLASS FAMILIES

by

Katheryn Dietrich and Lee Greiser*

Department of Rural Sociology
Texas Agricultural Experiment Station
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

UD015284

December, 1974

*The authors contributed equally to the preparation of this report. The ordering of the names is alphabetical and does not denote senior or junior authorship.

FOREWARD

This report was developed at my request to investigate the relative styles and conditions of life of Black families living in the heart of a large metropolitan ghetto area of Houston and those living in a relatively sparsely settled nonmetropolitan area. While it is not possible to derive broad generalizations about place of residence differences among Black families from such a comparison, the contrasting findings can provide some understandings about possible differences which might exist. Such information can give those involved in action programs and policy decisions a place to start in orienting themselves toward Black families located in vastly different types of community settings. At the same time the information reported should be of particular use to those interested in obtaining a more detailed understanding about the nature of family life of Blacks in the particular locations studied. As far as I know, this report provides the most comprehensive descriptions about these type of families living in East Texas.

Obviously, much more information must be gathered and analyzed before we can be sure that what we found for the few places studied here exists generally for other similar communities in Texas. Still, I am unaware of any published data providing evidence to contest the potential general nature of these findings.

I would, as a closing note, like to caution those readers of this report to hold the findings reported here tentatively - as a set of hypotheses to be confirmed or rejected by your own observations of the communities within which you are working. Also, I would like to ask

those of you with a strong interest in achieving a better understanding about the life conditions and life chances of Black families to relate to us any information you obtain which appears to either support or challenge the findings presented within this report.

We have developed reports of a number of other more specific analyses of data from this study and these are listed at the end of this report. Feel free to request any of these that you think could be of use to you.

William P. Kuvlesky
Project Leader
3-3-75

PREFACE

This report is a sequel to another monograph on black poverty, Black Families in A Nonmetropolitan Southern County: Social, Economic, and Psychological Attributes (Dietrich, 1973). This report compares nonmetropolitan data presented in the first manuscript with similar data collected on metropolitan lower-class black families. The report was prepared under the auspices of the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station project H-2906 and the United States Department of Agriculture, Cooperative State Research Service project NC-90, "Factors Affecting Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families."

While the authors accept full responsibility for the contents of this report, they wish to emphasize that the study design, population selection, instruments, and scales reflect efforts of the NC-90 Technical Committee. This committee consisted of representatives of Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Stations in the following states: California, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, Texas, Vermont, and Wisconsin. The Texas portion of the project was directed by Dr. William P. Kuvlesky, Texas A&M University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		*Page*
I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Samples	4
	The Study Areas	4
	Data Collection	5
	Definition of Family Members	6
	Description of Samples	6
III.	Economic Circumstances	8
	Total Disposable Family Incomes	8
	Poverty Status	9
	Income Regularity	11
	Number of Income Earners	12
	Perceived Adequacy of Income	14
	Sources of Income	15
	Earned Income as Percent of Total Disposable Income	16
	Nonmonetary Help	17
	Fixed Financial Commitments	20
	Fixed Expenses as Percent of Total Disposable Income	21
	Types of Financial Problems	22
	Living Conditions	24
	Summary of Residence Differences	27
IV.	Education and Occupations of Homemakers and their Husbands	30
	Education	30
	Job-training	31
	Occupations of Homemakers and Husbands	32
	Summary of Residence Differences	34
V.	The Family	35
	Father Presence of Absence	36
	Presence of Extended Kin	37
	Family Size	37
	Number of Children in the Families	39
	Conjugal Roles	40
	Marital Satisfaction	44
	Family Cohesiveness	45
	Child-rearing Orientations	46
	Summary of Residence Differences	48

Chapter		*Page*
VI.	Social Interaction	50
	Interaction with Kin versus Nonkin	50
	Interaction with Neighbors	51
	Voluntary-Group Participation	52
	Summary of Residence Differences	54
VII.	Orientations Toward the Future: Homemakers' Aspirations and Expectations	55
	Homemakers' Educational Projections	56
	Homemakers' Residence Goals	57
	Mothers' Aspirations and Expectations for their Children	60
	Summary of Residence Differences	65
VIII.	Conclusion	67
IX.	Appendixes	72
X.	References	79
XI.	List of H-2906 Reports	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table		*Page*
1.	Total Disposable Family Income for the Past Year by Place of Residence	9
2.	Poverty Index Scores of the Black Families by Place of Residence	11
3.	Assessed Income Regularity for Black Families by Place of Residence	12
4.	Number of Income Earners per Family by Type of Family and Place of Residence	13
5.	Mean Number of Income Earners by Poverty Index and Place of Residence	13
6.	Perceived Adequacy of Family Income by Place of Residence	14
7.	Sources of Income in the Past Year by Place of Residence	15
8.	Earned Income as Percent of Total Disposable Income by Place of Residence	17
9.	Percentage of Families Receiving Help Other Than Money by Source of Help and Place of Residence	18
10.	Amount of Help Gained by Family Raising Its Own Food and Making Its Own Clothes by Place of Residence	19
11.	The Families' Fixed Expenditures for the Past Year by Place of Residence	20
12.	Fixed Expenses as Percent of Total Disposable Income by Place of Residence	22
13.	Percentage of Black Families Perceiving Financial Problems by Place of Residence	23
14.	Living Conditions of the Black Families: Their Residences	24

Table		Page
15.	Living Conditions of the Black Families: Plumbing Facilities	25
16.	Living Conditions of the Black Families: Other Facilities	27
17.	Educational Attainment of Homemakers and their Husbands by Place of Residence	30
18.	Job-training of the Black Homemakers and Husbands by Place of Residence	31
19.	Occupations of the Black Homemakers and Husbands by Place of Residence	33
20.	Husbands Presence or Absence in the Family by Place of Residence	36
21.	Presence of Extended Kin in the Family Household by Place of Residence	37
22.	Size of the Black Families by Place of Residence	38
23.	Number of Children in the Families by Place of Residence	39
24.	Husband/Wife Contributors to Family Income in Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence	40
25.	Person Identified as Family's Main Income Source in Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence	41
26.	Person Identified as Head of the Household in Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence	41
27.	Main Decision-Makers in the Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence	42
28.	Main Implementers of Decisions in the Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence	43
29.	Marital Satisfaction of the Black Wives by Place of Residence	45
30.	Family Cohesiveness by Place of Residence	46

Table		*Page*
31.	Black Homemakers' Orientations ard Child-Rearing by Place of Residence.	47
32.	Interaction with Kin, versus Nonkin, by Place of Residence	51
33.	Interaction with Neighbors by Place of Residence.	52
34.	Percentage of Families with at least One Parent Attending Formal Groups Regularly by Place of Residence.	53
35.	Educational Projections of the Black Homemakers by Place of Residence.	56
36.	Homemakers' Aspirations regarding Rural/Urban Nature of Place of Residence by Current Place of Residence	58
37.	Proximity of Aspired Residence to Present Residence by Current Place of Residence.	59
38.	Homemakers' Projections for Geographical Mobility by Place of Residence	60
39.	Homemakers' Occupational Aspirations for their Sons by Place of Residence	62
40.	Homemakers' Occupational Aspirations for their Daughters by Place of Residence.	63
41.	Mothers' Educational Aspirations and Expectations for their Sons by Place of Residence	64
42.	Mothers' Educational Aspirations and Expectations for their Daughters by Place of Residence	65

APPENDIX TABLES

Table		Page
A-1	Selected Demographic Characteristics of Texas and the Study Area: 1970	73
A-2	Selected Socioeconomic Characteristics of Texas and the Study Area: 1970	74
B-1	Ages of the Homemakers and Husbands	76
B-2	Mean Ages of Children in the Families	76
B-3	Birthplaces of the Homemakers and Husbands	77
B-4	Portions of Homemakers' and Husbands' Lives Spent in Rural Areas	77
B-5	Number of Times the Family Moved in the Past Five Years	78

SUMMARY OF RESIDENCE DIFFERENCES

Variables	Nature of Residence Differences
Economic Circumstances	
Total Disposable Family Income	Higher in metropolitan.
Poverty Status	Inverse association with size of place of residence.
Income Regularity	Positive association with size of place of residence.
Number of Income Earners	More earners in nonpoverty metro families.
Perceived Adequacy of Income	Positive association with size of place of residence.
Sources of Income	NM urban more likely to receive earned income.
Earned Income as Percent of Total Disposable Income	Greatest among NM urban; least, among metro.
Nonmonetary Help	Kin more often helped in nonmetro families; neighbors, in metro families.
Fixed Financial Commitments	Housing higher for metro; credit installments greater for nonmetro.
Fixed Expenses as Percent of Total Disposable Income	Less among rural than NM urban or metro families.
Types of Financial Problems	NM urban reported the most financial problems.
Living Conditions	Nonmetro more likely to own their homes but were more dissatisfied with the size and conditions of their homes.
	Adequacy of plumbing positively associated with size of place of residence.
	Metro families were less likely to have telephones. Rural families were less likely to have garbage collection.
	Transportation problems greatest for NM urban.

SUMMARY OF RESIDENCE DIFFERENCES (cont'd)

Variables	Nature of Residence Differences
Education and Occupations of Homemakers and Their Husbands	
Education	Positive association with size of place of residence.
Job-training	Positive association with size of place of residence.
Occupations	NM urban homemakers were more likely to be employed.
	Unemployment of husbands was higher among the metro.
	Metro homemakers were more likely to be employed as low-level service workers and metro husbands, as unskilled laborers. Nonmetro homemakers and husbands were more likely to be semi-skilled laborers.
The Family	
Father Presence or Absence	Husband-absence was greater in the metro families.
Presence of Extended Kin	Metro families were less likely to be extended.
Family Size	Inverse association with size of place of residence.
Number of Children	Inverse association with size of place of residence.
Conjugal Roles	Wife versus husband dominance of decision-making and wife naming self as family head were greater in the metro families.
Marital Satisfaction	Metro wives appeared less satisfied with their marriages.
Family Cohesiveness	Inverse association with size of place of residence.
Nonpermissive Child-rearing Orientations	Inverse association with size of place of residence.

SUMMARY OF RESIDENCE DIFFERENCES (cont'd)

Variables	Nature of Residence Differences
Social Interaction	
Interaction with Kin versus Nonkin	Inverse association with size of place of residence.
Interaction with Neighbors	Less among metro homemakers.
Voluntary-Group Participation	Metro residents were more likely to attend community groups; nonmetro residents, job-connected groups. Rural residents were more likely to attend church and lodges.
Orientations toward the Future	
Educational Projections	Positive association with size of place of residence.
Residence Goals	Rural homemakers were more favorable and NM urban homemakers, least favorable towards their present place of residence.
Status Projections for their Children	Nonmetro mothers expressed higher educational projections for their children.

I. INTRODUCTION

A valid and serious criticism of the "culture-of-poverty" thesis as it relates to blacks is that it has been "over-ghettoized" (Thomas, 1972:65). That is, almost all of the data relevant to evaluation of this explanation of poverty has been collected in metropolitan ghettoes. This research bias is due perhaps to the long-lasting influence of E. Franklin Frazier. From Frazier (1939) to Moynihan (1965), Rainwater (1970), and numerous other contemporary writers (e.g., Clark, 1965; McCord, et al., 1969; Liebow, 1966 ; Scanzoni, 1971) the metropolitan ghetto has been singled out as an environment especially corrosive to family stability and deleterious to other aspects of family living, such as socialization. The emphasis these writers have placed on the metropolitan ghetto has led people to think that the primary caustic forces in the metropolitan ghetto are either not operative or, at the least, not as intense among nonmetropolitan blacks.

For the most part, available data on nonmetropolitan blacks are from studies of rural-to-urban migration. In terms of income, the metropolitan resident, irrespective of origin, has been shown to be better off than the rural or nonmetropolitan resident (Beale, 1971). Explanations for these income differences would seem to be more plentiful jobs, higher wages, and greater access to welfare agencies. In addition, black rural-to-urban migration has been selective. Blacks who have migrated from rural and nonmetropolitan areas were younger and better educated than the black population of these areas generally (Taeuber and Taeuber, 1965).

Income, of course, is only one aspect of family economics, and economics,

in turn, is only one type of external force which impinges on family living. If maintenance of stable and healthy family relationships is more difficult in the metropolitan ghetto than in nonmetropolitan and rural areas, the evidence of the migration studies suggests that forces other than economics are the causes of this difficulty. However, a premise of this argument has not yet been established: Do the aforementioned residence differences with respect to family relationships and interaction exist among poor, black Americans?

This report addresses the latter question and examines whether residence differences exist with respect to other characteristics purportedly associated with poverty. Black families of similarly low socioeconomic status but of the following three different types of residence are compared: (1) rural, (2) nonmetropolitan urban, (3) metropolitan.[1] Samples from all three places of residence were drawn from the eastern part of Texas, an area culturally akin to the Deep South. All three places of residence were low-income areas in terms of median incomes and percentages of residents in poverty (See Appendix A). The samples were restricted to families with children still in the home; thus, most of the elderly populations of the study areas, for which the culture-or-poverty thesis is not as meaningful, were excluded.

---

[1]The term place of residence will be used throughout this report to refer to these three types of residence. Place of residence, therefore, is not to be confused with the houses in which the families lived or other such denotations of the term residence.

Residence differences will be assessed with respect to the following:

a. indicators of the families' economic circumstances;

b. education and occupations of the black homemakers and husbands;

c. aspects of family structure and interaction;

d. interaction of the homemakers and husbands with persons and groups outside of their nuclear families;

e. aspirations and expectations of the black homemakers.

II. THE SAMPLES

The Study Areas

Selected demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the study areas are presented in Tables A-1 and A-2 of Appendix A. The information in these tables is briefly summarized in this chapter.

Nonmetropolitan. The rural and nonmetropolitan urban black populations chosen for study were located in Shelby county in East Texas. The county was predominantly rural, according to 1970 census statistics. The rural study area was comprised of two sparsely settled villages of less than 100 inhabitants. The nonmetropolitan urban study area consisted of the only urban center in the county. Its population was less than 5,000 persons and was approximately 30 percent black.

The predominant industries of the county were manufacturing of wood and food products. Pine pulpwood plants, lumber mills, poultry farms and poultry processing plants offered unskilled and semiskilled jobs which provided the most common sources of employment for the black working population of the county.

The study area was typical of many rural counties in that it had a declining and aging population. The latter fact contributed to a higher dependency ratio (i.e., number of persons under 18 and over 64 years of age per 100 persons 18 through 64 years of age) than the state of Texas generally. In addition, indicators of income, occupation, and education demonstrated strikingly lower aggregate socioeconomic attainment in the county of the study area than in the state as a whole.

The black population of the county was distinguished from the total black population of Texas by a markedly higher fertility ratio (i.e., number of children under five years of age per 1,000 women 15 to 49 years of age) as well as a higher dependency ratio. The county's blacks also appeared more economically disadvantaged than Texas blacks in general.

Metropolitan. The metropolitan black population chosen for study was located in an almost all-black ghetto in Houston's intercity. The study area was bounded by freeways and railroad tracks. This particular area of the city was chosen, because of its almost all-black population and because it was located within a census tract that exhibited a low median income and a higher proportion of residents in poverty than most of the other census tracts in the Houston SMSA area.

Data Collection

The black families included in the study were restricted to household family-units in which:

(1) at least one child under 18 years of age resided in the family home;

(2) a female homemaker normally resided in the home;

(3) the female homemaker mainly responsible for caring for the home was under 65 years of age;

(4) the female homemaker mainly responsible for caring for the home was over 18 years of age, unless she was the mother of one or more of the children living in the home.

All households in the rural and nonmetropolitan urban study areas and a fifty percent random sample of households in the metropolitan study area were screened to determine if they contained family-units which met the above criteria. A family-unit was operationally defined as an economically interdependent unit, so that it was possible for a

household to contain more than one family-unit if economic interdependence between two or more groups of household members was not established.

The female homemakers who took major responsibility for caring for the homes were the sources of information about the families.[2] Interviews were conducted with the nonmetropolitan homemakers during the summer of 1970 and with the metropolitan homemakers during the summer of 1971. Ninety-four to 100 percent of the homemakers of the eligible families were interviewed.

All of the homemakers were interviewed in their homes by trained black females. Specific questionnaire items will be described as appropriate in the following discussions.

Definition of Family Members

All persons who resided in the family's home at the time of the survey or for part of the twelve months preceding the survey were defined as family members if they were part of the economically interdependent family-unit in terms of provision of income or consumption and if they were not merely visiting for a short period of time (i.e., less than one month).

Description of Samples

The samples totaled 52 rural, 207 nonmetropolitan urban, and 294 metropolitan families. Tables in Appendix B present data regarding the

---

[2]The decision to interview only females was a pragmatic one of the NC-90 Technical Committee. The Committee acknowledges that this introduces a bias in the data.

ages, geographical origins, and geographical mobility of the black homemakers and their families. These data are summarized briefly here.

Ages. The median ages of the homemakers and their husbands ranged from 36 to 41 years and 36 to 45 years, respectively. Their children were most often between 6 and 15 years of age. The homemakers, husbands, and children tended to be slightly younger in the nonmetropolitan urban families than in the rural and metropolitan families.

Geographical Origins and Mobility. By most standards, the overwhelming majority of the rural homemakers and husbands could be classified nonmigrants, having been born locally (i.e., within 50 miles of their present residence) and having lived over half of their lives in rural areas. The large majority of nonmetropolitan urban homemakers and husbands were also born locally, and the majority had lived over half of their lives in nonrural areas (i.e., populative 2,500 or more) as they were doing at the time of the survey. In contrast, a majority of the metropolitan homemakers and husbands were born over 50 miles from their present residence, although almost all of the metropolitan homemakers and husbands were born in the South and in Texas. About three-fourths of the metropolitan homemakers and two-thirds of the metropolitan husbands had spent most of their lives in nonrural areas.

Only a small minority (one-fourth or less) of the black families of any of the places of residence had moved over once in the five years preceding the survey. About two-thirds of the rural families and about half of the nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan families had not moved at all in those five years.

III. ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES

A number of economic indicators in addition to monetary incomes per se are used to reflect the economic circumstances of the families. These indicators include amount of income in relation to number and ages of family members, dependability of income, the number of family members who must work for the family to be out of poverty, subjective perceptions of income adequacy and financial problems, nonmonetary aid which may defray expenses such as food or clothing, amount of fixed expenses, and living conditions. Also examined are residence differences in sources of income, sources of nonmonetary help, and kinds of fixed expenses.

Total Disposable Family Incomes

Total disposable family income was calculated for each family for the twelve months immediately preceding the survey. This income figure included (1) all income earned by any family member who made over $100 during the past year, including any income which was deducted from their paychecks except taxes or social security payments (e.g., insurance payments, union dues, etc.), and (2) all income received from any other sources (e.g., welfare, social security, etc.), excluding gifts or inheritances.

The majority of the black families, regardless of place of residence, had total disposable family incomes of $5,000 per year or less (Table 1), although the incomes of the metropolitan families were generally lower than those of the nonmetropolitan families. Mean and median incomes were

similar in the rural and nonmetropolitan urban samples, although more rural than nonmetropolitan urban families had incomes of $3,000 or less.

TABLE 1

Total Disposable Family Income[a] for Past Year
by Place of Residence

Total Income	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural (N=49)	Urban (N=201)	(N=283)
	Percent		
$3000 or less	26.5	18.4	36.4
3001-5000	28.6	33.8	32.2
5001-7000	14.3	25.4	11.7
7001-10,000	26.5	16.9	14.8
Over 10,000	4.1	5.5	4.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	3	6	11
Median	$4,714	$4,882	$3,748
Mean	5,289	5,276	4,439

[a]Total income excluding gifts or inheritances but including payroll deductions except taxes or social security payments.

Poverty Status

To better evaluate the families' abilities to meet their economic needs, a poverty index similar to that used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1970) was utilized. A poverty threshold for each family (i.e., the amount of money income which would have enabled the family to meet necessary expenses during the year preceding the survey) was calculated taking into account: (1) the number and ages of persons in the household; (2) what proportion of the past year each person resided in the household;

(3) the consumer price index for this particular region of the country and the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan nature of the communities of residence; and (4) farm or nonfarm residence. The poverty index score for each family was determined by dividing the family's total disposable income by its poverty threshold. An index score of 1.0 indicates that the income of the family was exactly the same as the family's poverty threshold--an income no more and no less than that estimated as needed to cover necessary expenses. A family was considered disadvantaged, or in poverty, if its poverty index (PI) score was less than 1.0. A family with a PI score of less than .75 was viewed as extremely disadvantaged. Those families having PI scores of 1.0 to 1.49 were considered marginal because their incomes provided for little beyond bare necessities. Furthermore, marginal families--especially those with PI scores between 1.0 and 1.25--are always potentially disadvantaged and tend to drift in and out of poverty because their incomes are not sufficient to cover emergency costs or to allow for partial or temporary loss of income due to job loss, illness, etc.

According to the poverty index, the majority of the black families in all three samples were disadvantaged or of marginal poverty status (Table 2). Over a fourth of the families of each place of residence were extremely disadvantaged (i.e., had poverty-index scores of less than .75), and more than a third had incomes below their poverty thresholds.

TABLE 2

Poverty Index Scores of the Black Families by Place of Residence

Poverty Index Score	Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=49)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=201)	Metropolitan (N=283)
	----------Percent----------		
0-.74	30.6	26.4	32.9
.75-.99	6.1	13.0	14.8
1.00-1.24	20.4	11.9	13.4
1.25-1.49	14.3	12.9	12.4
1.50 +	28.6	35.8	26.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	3	6	11
Median	114	103	103
Mean	120	134	121

Income Regularity

Income regularity was assessed for the twelve months immediately preceding the survey. The extent of irregularity of receipt of income increased with size of place of residence (Table 3). Half of the metropolitan families had irregular incomes compared to a third of the nonmetropolitan urban families and a fourth of the rural families. Few homemakers reported that their families' incomes were not at all dependable; however, the percentage of rural homemakers making this assessment was considerably higher than that of nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan homemakers.

TABLE 3

Assessed Income Regularity for Black Families by Place of Residence

Degree of Regularity	Village (N=52)	Town (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)
	----------	Percent	----------
Not Dependable At All	13.5	2.4	1.4
Fluctuating	13.5	30.9	50.7
Steady	73.0	66.7	47.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Number of Income Earners

A factor which is often ignored in economic analysis of low-income families is the number of family members contributing to the total family income. Given the low wages of many workers, the employment of family members in addition to the family head is often required to keep the family above the poverty level.

As shown in Table 4, there was little difference by place of residence in the number of earners per family. More than one earner was generally employed in the two-parent families, regardless of place of residence. Only one earner was generally employed in the one-parent families, again regardless of place of residence.

TABLE 4

Number of Income Earners per Family
by Type of Family and Place of Residence

Numbers of Earners	Nonmetropolitan Rural	Nonmetropolitan Urban	Metropolitan
	----------Percent of Families----------		
In Two-Parent Families			
0	9	2	4
1	36	41	49
2	48	52	40
3 or more	6	5	7
Total	100	100	100
(N)	(33)	(142)	(123)
Mean	1.7	1.6	1.5
In One-Parent Families			
0	26	11	33
1	69	65	53
2	5	18	11
3 or more	0	6	3
Total	100	100	100
(N)	(19)	(65)	(170)
Mean	0.8	1.2	0.9

Table 5 shows the number of family earners necessary to maintain certain poverty index scores. Poverty index scores increased with the increase in the number of family earners. More than one earner was usually shown in families having poverty index scores at or above poverty level. This tendency was more apparent the smaller the size of place of residence.

TABLE 5

Mean Number of Income Earners
by Poverty Index and Place of Residence

Poverty Index Scores	Nonmetropolitan Rural	Nonmetropolitan Urban	Metropolitan
	----Mean Number of Earners per Family---		
Less than .75	.53	1.04	.53
.75-.99	1.00	1.35	1.19
1.00-1.49	1.41	1.62	1.33
1.50 and over	2.06	1.78	1.59

Perceived Adequacy of Income

The black homemakers' subjective assessments of the adequacy of their incomes was elicited by the question, "To what extent do you think your (family) income is enough for you to live on?"

Generally, the black homemakers, regardless of place of residence, perceived their family incomes to be adequate for family needs (Table 6). Only about a fifth of the women considered their families' incomes to be inadequate. About half, regardless of place of residence, thought that their incomes were adequate to cover some wants beyond mere necessities, although very few of the homemakers of any place of residence considered their families' incomes to be more than adequate (i.e., sufficient to satisfy all wants and still provide for savings). Perceived adequacy of income increased slightly with the size of place of residence.

TABLE 6

Perceived Adequacy of Family Income by Place of Residence

Perceived Adequacy	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=207)	(N=294)
	Percent		
Not at all adequate	23.1	20.3	18.4
Can meet necessities	28.8	29.3	23.8
Can afford some but not all we want	44.2	49.3	52.7
Can afford about everything we want	1.9	1.0	3.1
Can afford everything we want and still can save money	1.9	0.5	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sources of Income

The black families of every place of residence were similar in that they were heavily dependent on salary or wages as compared to other possible sources of income. In every residence type, the proportions of families receiving wage or salary incomes (three-fourths to nine-tenths) were much larger than the proportions of families receiving income from any other source (Table 7). In addition, the mean incomes from salary or wages were substantially higher than the mean incomes from other sources, regardless of place of residence.

TABLE 7

Sources of Income in the Past Year by Place of Residence

Income Source	Rural		Nonmetropolitan Urban		Metropolitan	
	% families with income source (N)[a]	Mean annual income for families with income	% families with income source (N)[a]	Mean annual income for families with income	% families with income source (N)[a]	Mean annual income for families with income
Earned Income:	79(39)	$5492	93(190)	$4959	78(229)	$4823
Salary or Wages	75(37)	5398	92(190)	4832	77(227)	4829
Own Business	6(3)	4553	4(8)	3204	1(3)	1192
Other Source (e.g., commissions, boarders)	0	-----	10(21)	138	26(76)	921
Investment Returns	0	-----	5(10)	236	17(51)	541
Social Security Benefits (e.g., survivors, retirement, disability benefits)	17(9)	1835	14(28)	1775	10(30)	1817
Job-Related Benefits (e.g., unemployment, disability)	2(1)	1200	2(4)	521	3(9)	551
Armed Services Benefits (e.g., allotment, pension)	6(3)	1104	6(12)	1298	3(10)	947
Welfare Benefits:	17(9)	1370	10(20)	1071	29(86)	1418
Aid to the Blind	0	-----	0.5(1)	1092	0.3(1)	1368
Aid to Permanently & Totally Disabled	2(1)	780	4(8)	951	0.7(2)	1410
Old Age Assistance	8(4)	978	3(7)	1014	3(7)	798
Aid to Families with Dependent Children	6(3)	1124	2(5)	933	15(43)	1466
General Assistance	4(2)	2136	0.5(1)	946	12(35)	1352
Private Agency	0	-----	0	-----	0.7(2)	528
Legal Arrangements (e.g., child support, alimony)	0	-----	5(10)	648	8(23)	887

[a]Percent of families for which there is information. Figures in parentheses represent the total number of families receiving income from the source.

Nevertheless, salient residence differences in sources of income can be observed. A substantially greater proportion of nonmetropolitan urban than rural or metropolitan families received earned income--largely due to the greater proportion of nonmetropolitan urban families receiving salary or wage-income. However, when mean earnings of families receiving earned income are compared, the rural earnings are shown to be higher than either nonmetropolitan urban or metropolitan earnings.

The families of varying residence type were also similar in that the most common sources of their incomes other than salary or wages were welfare and social security benefits. Welfare benefits were received most frequently by metropolitan families and least frequently by nonmetropolitan urban families. This same pattern of residence differences was observed with respect to the mean amounts of welfare benefits for those receiving such benefits.

Place of residence differences can also be observed in the kinds of welfare benefits received. Aid to Families with Dependent Children and General Assistance were received by proportionately more metropolitan than nonmetropolitan urban or rural families. Comparing those families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the amount of benefit was also greater for the metropolitan families than nonmetropolitan urban or rural families. Comparisons among those families receiving General Assistance showed that the amount of benefit was greater for the rural families than families of the other place of residence types.

Earned Income as Percent of Total Disposable Income

Table 8 illustrates more clearly the reliance of the black families

of every place of residence on earned rather than unearned sources of income. In the majority of families, regardless of place of residence, earned income comprised three-fourths or more of their total disposable incomes. However, place of residence differences in dependence on earned income are evident. The predominance of earned over unearned sources of income was greatest among the nonmetropolitan urban families and least, among the metropolitan families.

TABLE 8

Earned Income as Percent of Total Disposable Income by Place of Residence

Percent of Disposable Income	Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=48)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=202)	Metropolitan (N=283)
	----------Percent----------		
0	14.6	5.9	19.4
1-25	0.0	3.5	2.8
26-50	2.1	2.5	4.6
51-75	12.5	7.4	9.9
75-100	70.8	80.7	63.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	4	5	11

Nonmonetary Help

The homemakers were asked how often they received "food, clothes, or anything else other than money" from the sources listed in Table 9. This nonmonetary help was received at least "sometimes" by most of the families, regardless of place of residence, but there were place of residence differences regarding the sources of such help.

TABLE 9

Percentage of Families Receiving Help Other Than Money by Source of Help and Place of Residence

Source	Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=52)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)
	Percent		
Other Relatives			
Sometimes	50.0	46.4	27.2
Often	7.7	3.9	5.4
Neighbors			
Sometimes	25.0	31.4	87.1
Often	1.9	0.5	12.6
Church			
Sometimes	5.8	8.2	6.1
Often	0.0	1.0	0.7
Other Friends			
Sometimes	9.6	21.7	19.1
Often	1.9	0.5	1.4
Government Programs			
Sometimes	7.7	2.9	4.4
Often	7.7	2.9	25.9
Other			
Sometimes	1.9	2.4	1.4
Often	1.9	0.5	1.7

The nonmetropolitan families were more likely to receive nonmonetary help from relatives than from any other source. About half of both the rural and nonmetropolitan urban homemakers, compared to only a third of the metropolitan homemakers, reported relatives to be a source of nonmonetary help. In contrast, the metropolitan homemakers most often reported neighbors as the source of their nonmonetary help. Nearly every metropolitan homemaker, compared to only a fourth or slightly more of the nonmetropolitan homemakers, reported neighbors as a source of this kind of help.

Regarding place of residence differences in other sources of nonmonetary help, the nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan families were

more likely than the rural families to get such help from "other friends." In addition, the metropolitan families were more likely than the nonmetropolitan families to receive nonmonetary help from "government programs." However, the maximum proportion of metropolitan homemakers to report receipt of nonmonetary help from either of these two sources was only about one-fourth. For all places of residence, reports of nonmonetary help from "churches" or "other" sources were negligible.

The homemakers were also asked how much help they obtained in meeting family needs by growing or raising their own food and by making clothes for their families. Not surprisingly, the degree of such help varied inversely with the size of place of residence (Table 10). Over half of the rural families regarded these two resources as being of some or a lot of help, and about a fourth of the nonmetropolitan urban families found these resources of at least some help. Few metropolitan homemakers reported these resources to be of any help.

TABLE 10

Amount of Help Gained by Family Raising Its Own Food and Making Its Own Clothes by Place of Residence

Percent of Families	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan (N=294)
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=207)	
	Percent		
Little or none	45.1	71.0	86.3
Some help	33.3	23.7	10.6
A lot of help	21.6	5.3	3.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
No information	1	0	1

Fixed Financial Commitments

Fixed financial commitments totaled slightly higher for the nonmetropolitan urban than the rural or metropolitan families (Table 11). Allocation of fixed commitments also differed by place of residence. Housing costs were the greatest fixed expense for the metropolitan families and credit installments, the greatest fixed expense for the nonmetropolitan families.

TABLE 11

The Families' Fixed Expenditures[a] For the Past Year By Place of Residence

Type of Fixed Expenditure	Rural		Nonmetropolitan Urban		Metropolitan	
	% families with expenditures (N)[b]	Mean expenditure for families with expenditure	% families with expenditures (N)[b]	Mean expenditure for families with expenditure	% families with expenditures (N)[b]	Mean expenditure for families with expenditure
TOTAL FIXED COMMITMENTS	100 (52)	$1,815	100 (205)[c]	$2,100	96 (283)[c]	$1,799
Housing	100 (52)	404	99 (205)	673	97 (286)	930
Rent or Mortgage	40 (21)	322	86 (177)	391	97 (284)	688
Utilities	100 (52)	287	99 (205)	340	93 (273)	267
Credit Installments	87 (45)	1,055	85 (175)	967	61 (178)	781
Insurance	88 (46)	335	94 (194)	393	86 (253)	307
Medical Costs	48 (25)	197	49 (102)	167	12 (37)	297
Union Dues	40 (21)	82	33 (68)	45	16 (47)	90
Child Support	2 (1)	24	1 (3)	289	0.7 (2)	386
Regular Child Care Costs	0	---	4 (8)	530	0.3 (1)	360
Alimony or Relative Support	0	---	0.5 (1)	150	0.3 (1)	1,092
Other Fixed Commitments	0	---	2 (5)	272	6 (17)	634
Church/Charity	81 (42)	100	78 (160)	126	67 (198)	121

[a] Includes payroll deductions.

[b] Percent of families for which there is information. Figures in parentheses represent the total number of families reporting the type of expenditure.

[c] Excludes two nonmetropolitan urban families and eleven metropolitan families for which there is no information.

Total housing costs increased substantially with the size of place of residence. The incidence of families reporting rent or mortgage expenses and the amount of these expenses for families reporting such expenses increased with the size of place of residence. The latter difference was especially conspicuous between the nonmetropolitan and metropolitan

families. Utility expenses, on the other hand, were least for the metropolitan[3] families and greatest for the nonmetropolitan urban families.

In contrast to fixed housing costs, credit installments were inversely associated with size of place of residence. Such installments as car payments may have been lower for the metropolitan residents because of their access to public transportation.

Fixed medical costs also differed substantially between the nonmetropolitan and metropolitan residents. Proportionately fewer metropolitan families than families of other residence reported fixed medical expenses, but the amount of such expenses for those reporting any was greater among the metropolitan residents.

Place of residence differences can also be observed in regard to union and church/charity contributions. The proportion of families with fixed expenses of this kind varied inversely with size of place of residence.

Residence differences in amount of expense can also be observed with respect to child support, regular child care costs, alimony or relative support, and "other fixed commitments"; however, the numbers reporting expenses of these kinds were small in every place of residence.

Fixed Expenses as Percent of Total Disposable Income

Fixed expenses took a lesser percentage of family income among the

---

[3]It is possible, of course, that utility expenses were more likely to be included in the rent of the metropolitan than nonmetropolitan residents.

rural families than either the nonmetropolitan urban or metropolitan families (Table 12). The nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan families were quite similar with respect to the ratio of fixed expenses to income.

TABLE 12

Fixed Expenses as Percent of Total Disposable Income by Place of Residence

Expenses as Percent of Income	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural	Urban	
	--------- Percent of Families ---------		
More than 75%	10.2	13.5	13.1
51 - 75%	8.1	23.0	21.0
26 - 50%	42.9	37.5	40.7
25% or less	38.8	26.0	25.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

Types of Financial Problems

Virtually all of the families surveyed reported some degree of trouble with financial problems. However, the frequency with which specific problems were reported varied by place of residence (Table 13).

The most frequently mentioned problems in more than half of the families of every place of residence were buying special things for children and saving money. Nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan families had more trouble than rural families in buying special things for their children. Rural and nonmetropolitan urban families found it more difficult to save money than did metropolitan families.

TABLE 13

Percentage of Black Families Perceiving Financial Problems by Place of Residence[a]

Type of Financial Problem	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural	Urban	
	Percent Perceiving Problem		
Buying enough food to last	26.9	39.6	45.2
Rent or house payment	11.5	24.6	18.3
Buying special things for kids	55.7	69.6	68.7
Paying dentist, doctor, medicine	51.9	62.8	45.9
Paying gas or electricity	21.1	28.5	15.1
Meeting large bills	40.4	62.3	42.0
Maintaining household equipment and appliances	34.6	39.7	32.5
Being able to buy new shoes or clothes	42.3	61.9	60.4
Saving money	69.2	70.1	55.6
Someone else spending money	0.0	5.7	7.1
Money being lost or stolen	0.0	3.4	2.7

[a] Percent who reported encountering this problem sometimes or often.

Paying medical bills and large debts and the purchase of new clothing were also frequently mentioned problems among families of every place of residence. However, the nonmetropolitan urban homemakers mentioned these problems more often than the rural or metropolitan homemakers, with the exception of metropolitan reports of problems purchasing new clothes. The latter was the second most frequent problem reported by the metropolitan families, even surpassing their difficulty in saving money.

"Buying enough food to last" was also a problem for nearly half of the metropolitan families. Incidence of this problem varied positively

with the size of place of residence. About a third of the nonmetropolitan urban families and a fourth of the rural families experienced this difficulty.

In general, the nonmetropolitan urban families had a higher reported incidence of financial problems than did the metropolitan and rural families. The nonmetropolitan urban families outranked the metropolitan and rural families for every type of financial problem except those relating to food, someone else spending money, and money being lost or stolen. The latter two problems were seldom reported in any of the samples, however.

Living Conditions

Their Residences. Whereas the majority of the nonmetropolitan families owned or were buying their homes, the overwhelming majority of metropolitan families were renters (Table 14). A consistent inverse relationship is shown between the size of place of residence and the ratio of owners or buyers to renters.

TABLE 14

Living Conditions of the Black Families: Their Residences

Living Conditions	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural	Urban	
	Percent		
Conditions of Occupancy			
Own or buying	80.8	60.4	9.6
Rent	11.5	36.7	89.4
Other (e.g., gift, squatter)	7.7	3.9	1.0
Perceived Adequacy of Size			
Less than Need	57.7	55.6	40.1
About Right or More	42.3	44.4	59.9
Perceived Adequacy in All Other Respects			
Satisfactory (includes very satisfactory)	59.6	51.7	66.0
Unsatisfactory	34.6	37.7	28.9
Very Unsatisfactory	5.8	9.7	4.8
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.3

For the most part, metropolitan families were more satisfied with their residences than were the nonmetropolitan families (Table 14). Well over half of the metropolitan families were satisfied with the size and other aspects of their houses. In contrast, most of the rural and nonmetropolitan urban families thought their homes were inadequate in size and about half of them reported that their homes were also unsatisfactory in other respects.

Plumbing Facilities. Adequacy of plumbing facilities varied consistently and positively with the size of place of residence (Table 15). Nearly the entire metropolitan sample had hot and cold piped water, flush toilets and showers. At the other extreme, the majority of rural homes lacked piped water, flush toilets, bathtubs and showers. A little more than half of the nonmetropolitan urban sample had hot and cold piped water, and only about one-fifth lacked piped water completely. From over a third to nearly a half of the nonmetropolitan urban homes did not have flush toilets or bathtubs or showers.

TABLE 15

Living Conditions of the Black Families: Plumbing Facilities

	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural	Urban	
	Percent		
Water			
Hot & Cold Piped Water	38.5	57.5	98.0
Cold Piped Water Only	1.9	22.7	2.0
No Piped Water	59.6	19.8	0.0
Source of Water Not Piped:			
Own well	90.3	12.2	Not
Shared or Community well	6.5	70.7	Applicable
Water Purchased	3.2	14.6	
Flush Toilets			
For this Household Only	38.5	61.4	98.0
Shared by Another Household	0.0	1.0	1.4
No Flush Toilet	61.5	37.7	0.7
Bathtub or Shower			
For this Household Only	38.5	53.6	93.8
Shared by Another Household	0.0	0.5	1.4
No tub or shower	61.5	45.9	4.8

Other Facilities. In reference to other facilities, the majority of the rural and nonmetropolitan urban families had telephones in their homes or could be easily reached by telephone (Table 16). In contrast, the overwhelming majority of metropolitan homes did not have telephones nor could be easily reached by someone else's telephone. The large majority of the families, regardless of place of residence, had working television sets in their homes. None of the rural families but nearly all of the nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan families had garbage collection.

Transportation. The majority of metropolitan families used buses, whereas the majority of rural workers used their personal cars and car pools and the majority of nonmetropolitan urban workers used their personal cars and taxis (Table 16). Use of personal car and car pool varied inversely and consistently with the size of place of residence.

The nonmetropolitan urban homemakers were more likely than the homemakers of the other residences to report sources of transportation "not used but needed." Well over three-fourths of these homemakers reported a need for bus service. About half of the rural respondents mentioned this need. Slightly less than half of the nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan families had needs for a personal car. A similar proportion of the rural families reported needs for motorcycles or bikes.

Despite these expressed needs, few families of any of the places of residence reported transportation problems as "often" affecting the jobs of their main income earners. Transportation problems were reportedly greatest among the nonmetropolitan urban families and least among the rural families.

TABLE 16

Living Conditions of the Black Families: Other Facilities

	Nonmetropolitan		
	Rural	Urban	Metropolitan
	Percent		
Telephone			
Telephone in the Home	48.0	40.1	6.1
No Telephone, but Can Be Reached Easily	38.5	44.4	17.4
No Telephone	13.5	15.5	76.5
Garbage Collection			
Yes	0.0	87.9	99.0
No	100.0	12.1	1.0
Television Set			
Color TV	11.5	8.7	15.3
Black & White Only	78.8	79.7	78.2
No TV Set	9.6	11.6	6.5
Transportation			
Bus: Used	0.0	0.5	75.9
Not Used but Need	50.0	83.1	3.1
Taxi: Used	3.9	77.3	21.1
Not Used but Need	25.0	7.7	15.0
Car Pool: Used	57.7	32.4	18.7
Not Used but Need	9.6	28.0	9.5
Own Car: Used	75.0	53.1	37.1
Not Used but Need	25.0	40.1	39.5
Motorcycle, Bike: Used	17.3	19.3	2.4
Not Used but Need	44.2	37.2	2.0
Affect of Transportation Problems on Job of Main Income Earner:[a]			
Seldom or Never	84.8	62.3	70.1
Sometimes	6.5	19.4	15.7
Often	8.7	18.4	6.7

[a] In those families where someone is employed.

Summary of Residence Differences

The economic indicators of total family incomes, poverty index scores, and regularity of income suggest that the metropolitan families were economically worse off than the nonmetropolitan urban or rural families. A direct inverse association was observed between the size of place of residence and the economic indicators of poverty index and regularity of income, suggesting that the rural families enjoyed the best economic conditions of the three residence groups.

However, other indicators pertinent to assessments of income adequacy and economic conditions give different results in terms of place of residence differences. Fewer earners per family were necessary to maintain poverty index scores above marginal poverty level (i.e., 1.50 or above) the larger the size of place of residence. Furthermore, subjective perceptions of income adequacy tended to increase with increase in the size of place of residence. In reference to various types of financial problems, the nonmetropolitan urban families almost consistently reported a higher incidence of problems than the metropolitan or rural families. In addition, the total amount of fixed commitments tended to be higher for the nonmetropolitan urban families than for families of the other types of residence.

With regard to sources of income, the nonmetropolitan urban families relied more on earned income and less on welfare than either the metropolitan or rural families. Families of all three places of residence reported receiving nonmonetary help; however, the sources of such help differed by place of residence. The nonmetropolitan families tended to rely on relatives; the metropolitan families, on neighbors. Not surprisingly, of course, the amount of economic help gained by the families growing their own food and making their own clothes varied inversely with size of place of residence. The former perhaps contributed to much higher reports of problems buying enough food to eat among the metropolitan than nonmetropolitan families.

With respect to specific types of fixed expenses, the highest expenses for the metropolitan and nonmetropolitan families were housing

and credit installments, respectively. Housing costs were positively associated with the size of place of residence; amount of credit installments were inversely associated with the size of place of residence.

Part of the place of residence difference in housing costs might be explained by the fact that the metropolitan residents were more likely than the other residence types to be renters instead of home-owners. Nevertheless, the metropolitan residents were more satisfied with the conditions of their homes than the other residence types. Adequacy of plumbing facilities and garbage collection were also positively associated with the size of place of residence.

The higher credit installments of the nonmetropolitan families perhaps can be explained in part by their need for cars in lieu of access to public transportation systems. Transportation problems were reported more often by the nonmetropolitan urban residents than the rural or metropolitan residents.

IV. EDUCATION AND OCCUPATIONS OF HOMEMAKERS AND THEIR HUSBANDS

Education

The educational attainment of the homemakers and husbands was conspicuously low, regardless of place of residence (Table 17). More than half of the homemakers and husbands of every place of residence had not completed high school. The proportions having attended college were negligible.

TABLE 17

Educational Attainment of Homemakers and their Husbands by Place of Residence

Years of School	HOMEMAKERS			HUSBANDS		
	Nonmetropolitan			Nonmetropolitan		
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=205)	Metropolitan (N=293)	Rural (N=32)	Urban (N=146)	Metropolitan (N=126)
	Percent			Percent		
0 - 6	11.8	10.2	9.2	36.7	22.0	16.6
7 - 8	21.6	20.9	15.7	16.7	21.1	15.1
9 - 11	37.2	31.1	40.3	6.6	32.9	28.7
High School Graduate	21.6	32.5	30.0	40.0	20.4	34.9
Some College	7.8	5.3	4.4	0.0	3.6	3.9
College Graduate	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	0	2	1	1	0	8

Mean Number of Years of Formal Schooling:

Homemakers: Rural = 9.7, NM Urban = 9.9, Metro = 10.1

Husbands: Rural = 8.5, NM Urban = 8.9, Metro = 9.8

Nevertheless, educational attainment of both homemakers and husbands increased with the size of place of residence. Place of residence differences in education were most conspicuous among the husbands. Metropolitan husbands averaged about a year more of completed education than the rural or nonmetropolitan urban husbands. While the rural sample had the highest proportion of husbands who were high school graduates, they also had the highest proportion having completed less than seven grades.

In every place of residence, the homemakers averaged more formal schooling than the husbands. Mean differences in educations of homemakers compared to husbands varied inversely with the size of place of residence. However, comparing only means might be misleading. Proportions of husband high school graduates were greater than proportions of homemaker high school graduates in the rural and metropolitan samples. This difference between the spouses was substantial in the rural sample. Offsetting this husband advantage in both the rural and metropolitan samples were greater proportions of husbands than homemakers having completed less than six grades. In the nonmetropolitan urban sample, husbands were more disadvantaged than homemakers with respect to both ends of the educational scale.

Job-training

The overwhelming majority of the homemakers and husbands, regardless of place of residence, had not received any job-training (Table 18). The proportions who had received job-training, however, varied positively with the size of place of residence. This relationship held among both

TABLE 18

Job-training of the Black Homemakers and Husbands by Place of Residence

Type of Training	HOMEMAKERS			HUSBANDS		
	Nonmetropolitan			Nonmetropolitan		
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=206)	Metropolitan (N=294)	Rural (N=33)	Urban (N=144)	Metropolitan (N=134)
	Percent			Percent		
Vocational Schools (Tuition)	1.9	6.8	19.0	0.0	2.1	7.4
Government Training Program	0.0	0.5	2.4	3.0	2.1	1.4
On-the-Job Training	0.0	4.4	1.7	0.0	4.2	9.7
Training, Unsure of Origin	1.9	0.5	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7
None	96.2	87.8	76.2	97.0	91.6	79.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	0	1	0	0	2	0

the homemakers and husbands with regard to training by vocational schools requiring tuition payments and among the husbands with regard to on-the-job training. In both the nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan samples, vocational schools were the most frequent source of job-training for the homemakers while on-the-job training was the most frequent source of job-training for the husbands.

Occupations of Homemakers and Husbands

Respondents were asked to name all of the jobs that they and their spouses had held during the year preceding the interview. Occupational data were grouped into 32 categories by prestige-rank and qualitative differences.[4]

Regardless of place of residence, the majority of homemakers and husbands who were employed held low prestige jobs requiring little or no specialized training (Table 19). In the case of the homemakers, large percentages of them were not employed outside of the home. The nonmetropolitan urban homemakers were more likely to be employed than either the metropolitan or rural homemakers--about two-thirds of the nonmetropolitan urban homemakers compared to half of the rural or metropolitan homemakers were employed. The proportions of homemakers employed in white-collar jobs and the proportions employed as low-level service workers increased with the size of place of residence. Low-level service jobs were by far the most common source of employment for the metropolitan homemakers. Unskilled jobs in addition to low-level service jobs were the most frequent sources

---

[4]See Dietrich (1973) for details of the procedures of occupational classification.

of employment for the metropolitan homemakers.

TABLE 19

Occupations of the Black Homemakers and Husbands by Place of Residence

Occupational Classification	HOMEMAKERS			HUSBANDS		
	Nonmetropolitan			Nonmetropolitan		
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)	Rural (N=32)	Urban (N=146)	Metropolitan (N=133)
	Percent			Percent		
White Collar	5.8	6.6	14.3	0.0	4.9	7.5
Skilled	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.0	6.3	15.1
Military (Noncommissioned Officers and Enlisted Men)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.5
Semiskilled	11.5	7.7	2.4	75.0	49.4	26.3
Service (Low-level)	13.5	25.7	33.5	0.0	4.2	10.5
Unskilled	15.4	21.3	2.1	18.8	26.8	28.6
Farm Laborers	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0
Not Employed	51.9	36.2	47.4	6.2	4.9	10.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	0	0	0	1	0	1

The majority of the husbands, regardless of place of residence, were employed as semiskilled and unskilled laborers. The predominance of semiskilled employment varied inversely with the size of place of residence, with three-fourths of the rural husbands compared to half of the nonmetropolitan urban husbands and only a fourth of the metropolitan husbands in these kinds of jobs. Unskilled employment, on the other hand, was more prevalent among the nonmetropolitan urban and metropolitan than the rural husbands.

On the whole, dispersion across the variety of types of occupations was greater the larger the size of place of residence, and metropolitan husbands had larger representation in white-collar, skilled, and service

jobs than husbands of the other places of residence. Unemployment was also higher among the metropolitan than nonmetropolitan husbands.

Summary Of Residence Differences

Both education and job-training of the homemakers and their husbands were positively associated with the size of place of residence. Therefore, the metropolitan residents would seem to have been best prepared and the rural residents, least prepared to meet occupational prerequisites. These residence differences in educational attainment, however, did not generally result in better jobs for the metropolitan homemakers and husbands. A comparison of the two most frequent types of husbands' occupations, semiskilled and unskilled, showed that the higher-prestige semiskilled occupations were more predominant the smaller the size of place of residence. Furthermore, unemployment was highest among the metropolitan husbands.

The occupations of the homemakers, on the other hand, were of similar prestige in all three samples. Residence differences in the homemakers' occupations were primarily qualitative. Labor force participation, however, was higher among the nonmetropolitan urban homemakers than among the homemakers of the other residence types.

V. THE FAMILY

Family variables (i.e., aspects of family structure and interaction) have received especial attention in studies of poverty since publication of the Moynihan (1965) report. Moynihan (1965:5) argues that "at the heart of the deterioration of the fabric of Negro society is the deterioration of the Negro family." While attributing the origins of black poverty to slavery, racial discrimination, and urbanization, Moynihan claims that the weakness of the black family is the chief force now serving to perpetuate the cycle of poverty among black Americans.

The Moynihan report, however, is the most controversial work to be published about black Americans in recent years. The report has been criticized for methodological errors and, especially, for interpreting correlations of census statistics as causal relationships. It appears that enough research has not been done on lower-class black families to document many of Moynihan assertions about the weakness of the black family, much less to support notions that such weakness is the cause and not the effect of black poverty. Moreover, Moynihan primarily made reference to black families of metropolitan ghettoes. Virtually no research has been done to compare metropolitan and nonmetropolitan black populations with respect to the strength or weakness of their family structures.

The objective in this section of the report is to make residence comparisons of variables which many sociologists purport reflect weakness of families and contribute to poverty. These variables include

father-absence, presence of extended kin in the same household, large family size, wife dominance of decision-making and decision-implementation, marital dissatisfaction, incohesive family units, and excessively nonpermissive child-rearing practices. The authors caution, however, that whether the foregoing characteristics are in fact evidence of weakness in black families is problematic at this stage of family research. Robert Hill (1971) suggests that some of these characteristics which the white middle-class may regard as "deviant" are instead a "strength" of black families because they reflect "adaptability of family roles."

Father Presence or Absence

This variable refers to whether or not a husband of the black homemaker was living in the household at the time of the survey. As shown in Table 20, a husband was much less likely to be present in the metropolitan households than in the nonmetropolitan households. Specifically, the husband was absent in over half of the metropolitan families compared to only about a third of the nonmetropolitan rural or urban families.

TABLE 20

Husband Presence or Absence in the Family by Place of Residence

Family Composition	Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=52)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan
	Percent		
Husband Present	63.5	68.6[a]	42.5[c]
Husband Absent	36.5	31.4[b]	57.5[d]
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

[a] Includes one family in which the husband entered the household during the year.

[b] Includes four families in which the husband was present only part of the year but was no longer living in the household at the time of the interview.

[c] Includes two families in which the husband entered the household during the year.

[d] Includes nine families in which the husband was present part of the year but was no longer living in the household at the time of the interview.

Presence of Extended Kin

Each household was classified as extended or nonextended according to whether or not the household included a person related to the homemaker or her husband other than their own children or foster children. The classification scheme provided for the possibility of a "non-family" group (i.e., a household in which none of the members were related to the respondent by blood, marriage, or adoption).

The metropolitan families were less likely than the nonmetropolitan families--either the rural or urban--to have extended kin living in their households (Table 21). Nevertheless, the majority of the households of all three places of residence were not extended. No non-family households were found in any of the place of residence samples.

TABLE 21

Presence of Extended Kin in the Family Household by Place of Residence

Family Composition	Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=52)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)
	Percent		
Extended	36.5	32.9	25.8
Not Extended	63.5	66.7	74.2
Non-family	0.0	0.0	0.0

Family Size

Two indicators of family size are reported: (1) the total number of persons who resided in the household during the year preceding the survey; and (2) the total number of persons who resided in the household during the year by the portion of the year each person resided in the household. For example, if a person resided in the household for only

six months of the year preceding the survey, he was counted as one person by the first indicator of family size but as only one-half a person by the second indicator. This second indicator of family size had been labeled "number of year-equivalent persons." It is a more accurate indicator of the number of persons the families were economically responsible for during the year than the first indicator.

Very large families were uncommon in all of the place of residence samples. Three-fourths or more of the families, regardless of place of residence, were comprised of six or less members by both measurements of family size (Table 22). Half or more of the families of every place of residence had only five or less members.

TABLE 22

Size of the Black Families by Place of Residence

Number of Persons	TOTAL LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD DURING YEAR			TOTAL YEAR-EQUIVALENT PERSONS		
	Nonmetropolitan			Nonmetropolitan		
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)
	Percent			Percent		
2 or less	0.0	2.4	10.9	0.0	7.8	15.6
3	11.6	18.3	23.8	15.4	19.3	24.8
4	21.2	20.8	19.1	21.2	18.8	17.2
5	19.2	18.3	16.0	19.2	17.9	15.2
6	23.1	14.5	12.9	23.1	16.0	12.5
7	7.7	13.1	7.1	3.9	10.6	6.2
8	9.6	4.3	5.1	11.5	4.3	4.8
9 or more	7.6	8.3	5.1	5.7	5.3	3.7
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	5.8	5.3	4.7	5.7	5.0	4.4
Median	5	5	4	5	5	4
Maximum	17	14	12	16	11	12

However, family size, in terms of both indicators, was inversely related to the size of place of residence. The rural families averaged the most family members; the metropolitan families, the least. Maximum family size was also largest for the rural samples and smallest for the metropolitan sample. Over half of the metropolitan families had four members or less; slightly less than half of the nonmetropolitan families and only about a third of the rural families were this small.

Number of Children in the Families

Children are defined for the purposes of this study as all persons in the household who were under 18 years of age. In general, the number of children in the families was small. The majority of families, regardless of place of residence, had three or less children (Table 23). The modal number of children in each sample was two. Number of children per family tended to decrease in size the larger the place of residence, but these differences were not substantial.

TABLE 23

Number of Children in the Families by Place of Residence

Number of Children	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural	Urban	
	Percent		
2 or less	40.4	47.3	53.6
3	17.3	18.4	17.7
4	19.2	14.0	13.3
5	13.5	10.1	8.2
6 or more	9.6	10.2	7.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	3.1	2.8	2.7
Median	3.0	3.0	3.0
Mode	2.0	2.0	2.0

Conjugal Roles

In those families in which wives and husbands were living in the same household at the time of the survey, the roles of the husbands and wives were examined in terms of their contributions to family income, wives' identification of family heads, and husbands' and wives' relative participation in familial decision-making and in implementation of some types of decisions.

Income Contributors. These data are contrary to notions that the black husband is an economic parasite on the black family. In the overwhelming majority of husband-present families, regardless of place of residence, the husband was a contributor to family income during the year preceding the survey (Table 24). The wife was more likely to share income-producing responsibilities in the nonmetropolitan samples than in the metropolitan sample. However, in every place of residence,

TABLE 24

Husband/Wife Contributors to Family Income in Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence

Contributors during the year	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan (N=124)
	Rural (N=33)	Urban (N=142)	
	Percent		
Husband, Not Wife	39.4	39.5	50.0
Wife, Not Husband	3.0	2.8	5.6
Husband & Wife	48.5	54.2	38.8
Neither Spouse	9.1	3.5	5.6
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

the husband was overwhelmingly identified by the homemaker as the family's main income source (Table 25).

TABLE 25

Person Identified as Family's Main Income Source in Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence

Main Earner	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan (N=124)
	Rural (N=33)	Urban (N=142)	
	Percent		
Husband	100.0	93.0	93.6
Wife	0.0	7.0	5.6
Other	0.0	0.0	0.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

Family Head. The black wives (i.e., homemakers whose husbands were living in their households) were also asked to identify the persons they considered heads of their households. Again the overwhelming majority of wives named their husbands. The small proportions of wives naming themselves as family heads increased with the size of place of residence (Table 26).

TABLE 26

Person Identified as Head of the Household in Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence

Household Head	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan (N=124)
	Rural (N=33)	Urban (N=142)	
	Percent		
Husband	100.0	91.5	87.8
Wife	0.0	8.5	12.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

Participation in Decision-Making. The black homemakers were asked to identify the persons (themselves, their husbands, or both together) who mainly decide about the following decisions: (1) "...which friends you (husband and wife) see the most?" (2) "...the best place for the family to live?" (3) "...about the wife working outside the home?"

(4) "...about the number of children wanted?" (5) "...how to handle the children?" (6) "...how the money is used?" (Table 27).

TABLE 27

Main Decision-Makers in the Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence

Type of Decision	Who Mainly Decides					
	Wife	Husband	Both	Doesn't Apply	Total Percent	Total
	Percent					
Friends:						
Rural	33.3	6.1	60.6		100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	23.2	12.0	64.8		100.0	142
Metropolitan	27.6	12.6	59.8		100.0	126
Where to Live:						
Rural	6.1	42.4	51.5		100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	12.7	28.9	58.4		100.0	142
Metropolitan	26.0	22.8	51.2		100.0	126
Number of Children:						
Rural	33.3	3.0	63.7	0.0	100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	26.3	18.4	52.5	2.8	100.0	141
Metropolitan	39.7	6.3	50.8	3.2	100.0	126
How to Handle the Children:						
Rural	36.4	24.2	39.4		100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	28.2	17.6	54.2		100.0	142
Metropolitan	29.1	7.1	63.8		100.0	126
How to Spend the Money:						
Rural	24.2	30.3	45.5		100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	21.1	16.9	62.0		100.0	142
Metropolitan	29.1	11.0	59.9		100.0	126
About the Wife Working:						
Rural	69.7	12.1	18.2		100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	47.6	24.2	28.2		100.0	141
Metropolitan	41.8	29.1	29.1		100.0	126

With a few exceptions, the majority of wives perceived family decisions to be joint decisions (i.e., both spouses were main participants in decision-making), regardless of place of residence. A conspicuous exception to this concerned the decision about the wife working. In all three samples, this decision was more likely to be made by the wife than the husband or both jointly. Wife-dominance of this decision was more conspicuous among the rural than the nonmetropolitan urban or metropolitan families.

The wife alone was also named the main decision-maker more frequently than the husband alone in reference to most of the other types of decisions. This pattern held in all three samples in reference to decisions about friends, number of children, and how to handle the children.

The husband alone was named more frequently than the wife alone in the rural sample in reference to decisions about spending money and in both nonmetropolitan samples in reference to deciding where to live. The rural husbands were substantially more dominant in this latter decision than the nonmetropolitan urban or metropolitan husbands.

Decision Implementers. The respondents were also asked "who does" limit the number of children, handle the children, and handle money matters. In all three places of residence, decision-implementation was less often shared than decision-making. In roughly a third of the black families, decision-implementation was a shared activity (Table 28). More often it was wife-dominated.

TABLE 28

Main Implementers of Decisions in the Husband-Present Families by Place of Residence

Who Does:	Wife	Husband	Both	Doesn't Apply	Total Percent	Total N
			Percent			
Limit the Number of Children:						
Rural	57.6	6.0	36.4	0.0	100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	41.4	11.4	44.3	2.9	100.0	140
Metropolitan	61.4	0.8	34.6	3.2	100.0	126
Handle the Children:						
Rural	27.3	33.3	39.4		100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	33.3	23.4	43.3		100.0	141
Metropolitan	45.2	16.7	38.1		100.0	126
Handle Money Matters:						
Rural	39.4	27.3	33.3		100.0	33
Nonmetro Urban	44.4	16.9	38.7		100.0	142
Metropolitan	56.7	15.0	28.3		100.0	126

Nevertheless, considering both the number of families in which decision-implementation was shared plus the number of families in which

the husband was the dominant implementer, the husband appeared to play a significant role in decision-implementation in the bulk of the rural and nonmetropolitan urban families. Metropolitan husbands were less active deciison-implementers than nonmetropolitan husbands. This pattern of residence differences held with respect to all three decision-areas. Husbands were most concerned with the handling of children in the non-metropolitan samples. In the metropolitan sample, they were about equally concerned with handling children and money matters.

Marital Satisfaction

A scale reflecting the black homemaker's degree of satisfaction with her husband was developed from the homemaker's responses to the following questions:

(1) How satisfied are you with your husband's understanding of your problems and feelings?

(2) How satisfied are you with the attention you receive from your husband?

(3) How satisfied are you with your husband's help around the home?

(4) How satisfied are you with the time you and your husband spend just talking?

Alternative responses were "very satisfied," "somewhat satisfied," "very dissatisfied," or "somewhat dissatisfied." These responses were assigned values of four through one, respectively, and marital-satisfaction index scores were derived by summing the values of the responses to the four items. Because there was a tendency in the samples to respond "very satisfied," only the maximum score of 16 (i.e., responses of "very satisfied" to each question) was classified as "high" marital satisfaction; scores of 9-15 were designated "medium satisfaction; scores of 4-8 (indicating dissatisfaction on a majority of the items) were designated "low."

The large majority of the black wives, regardless of place of residence, scored in the "medium" range of the marital satisfaction scale (Table 29). Few of the wives, again regardless of place of residence, scored "low" on the marital satisfaction scale. However, the proportion of metropolitan wives in the "low" range was more than twice that of the rural and of the nonmetropolitan urban wives.

TABLE 29

Marital Satisfaction of the Black Wives by Place of Residence

Marital Satisfaction	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan (N=122)
	Rural (N=32)	Urban (N=142)	
	Percent		
Low	6.3	6.3	12.3
Medium	81.2	74.7	70.5
High	12.5	19.0	17.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	1	0	2

Family Cohesiveness

For the purposes of this analysis, the following two items were combined into a family cohesiveness index:

(1) How often do you go places together as a family?

(2) How often do family members work around the house together? Response alternatives were "often," "sometimes," "seldom," and "never." In computation of the index scores, these responses were assigned values of four through one, respectively, and the values of the responses to the two items were summed. No score was computed if either of the two items was unanswered. If the values of the responses totaled eight

(the homemaker responded "often" to both questions), her family was accorded a "high" cohesiveness score. Scores of five to seven were classified "medium" cohesiveness; scores of two to four, as "low" cohesiveness.

An inverse relationship can be observed between family cohesiveness and size of place of residence (Table 30). However, the majority of families scored "medium" on the cohesiveness scale, and few families scored "low," regardless of place of residence.

TABLE 30

Family Cohesiveness by Place of Residence

Family Cohesiveness	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=207)	(N=290)
	Percent		
High	32.7	22.2	18.6
Medium	61.5	66.7	66.2
Low	5.8	11.1	15.2
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	0	0	4

Child-Rearing Orientations

The black homemakers were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:[5/]

(1) Most kids should be toilet trained by 15 months of age.

(2) Kids should be nicer than they are to their mothers since their mothers suffer so much for them.

[5/] These items were adapted from a scale previously utilized by family researchers at Kansas State University (Cromwell, 1968).

(3) Most kids should be spanked more often.

(4) A child should be taken away from the breast or bottle as soon as possible.

(5) The main goal of a parent is to see that the kids stay out of trouble.

Alternative responses were: "definitely agree," "tend to agree," "not sure," "tend to disagree," and "definitely disagree." These alternatives were accorded values of one through five, respectively, and the values of the respondents' answers were summed. Scores of 5-10 were designated "permissive"; 11-19, "mixed"; and 20-25, "nonpermissive."

Substantial place of residence differences were observed in orientations toward child-rearing and size of community of residence (Table 31). Although the majority of homemakers, regardless of place of residence, were nonpermissive in their orientations toward child-rearing, nonpermissive orientations were more prevalent the smaller the size of place of residence.

TABLE 31

Black Homemakers' Orientations toward Child-Rearing by Place of Residence

	Nonmetropolitan		
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)
	Percent		
Permissive	0.0	0.0	0.7
Mixed	9.6	19.8	34.3
Nonpermissive	90.4	80.2	65.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

Summary of Residence Differences

The following family characteristics were more prevalent among the metropolitan than nonmetropolitan families: father-absence, wife dominance of familial decision-implementation, wife's perception of self as family head, marital dissatisfaction, and lack of family cohesiveness. A direct positive relationship was observed between lack of family cohesiveness and the size of place of residence.

On the other hand, a number of other characteristics were more often observed among the nonmetropolitan than metropolitan families: presence of extended kin, larger family size, larger number of children per family, and nonpermissive child-rearing orientations. A direct inverse association was observed between size of place of residence and family size, number of children per family, and nonpermissive child-rearing orientations.

It should be emphasized, however, that most of these residence differences are overshadowed by similarities between the black families--similarities in characteristics which are contrary to notions that most lower-class blacks have pathological characteristics. Instead of weak, irresponsible, financial parasites, most of the black fathers played active, responsible familial roles as chief income producers and as equal sharers of conjugal power. Most of the conjugal relationships appeared at least moderately stable, if wife's expression of marital satisfaction is any indication.[6/] The majority of black families also

---

[6/] Scanzoni (1971) cites evidence indicating that black wives' marital satisfaction is positively related to family stability--more so than husbands' marital satisfaction.

appeared at least moderately cohesive. In regard to family composition, the families were generally nuclear family units (i.e., not including extended kin) and were of small to moderate size in terms of total number of family members and number of children per family.

VI. SOCIAL INTERACTION

This chapter focuses on interaction of the blacks with persons and groups outside of their households. Culture-of-poverty theorists (for example, Cohen and Hodges, 1963) emphasize the detrimental results of lower-class persons' nearly exclusive interaction with "solidary familiars" (e.g., kin, neighbors, or adolescent peer groups) in lieu of interaction with other friends or participation in voluntary associations. While not denying the functional aspects of relationships with solidary familiars, these theorists emphasize that nearly exclusive dependence on these relationships results in a narrow experience world which hinders the accumulation of knowledge and skills requisite for socioeconomic mobility. The concern here is: do these aspects of social interaction vary by place of residence.

Interaction with Kin versus Nonkin

All of the black homemakers who had relatives within visiting distance (i.e., "visiting distance means you would go and return the same day") were asked about their interaction with these relatives in terms of the following: (1) getting help; (2) giving help; (3) talking about problems; (4) spending time with. The homemakers were informed that "relatives" in this context referred to kin not living in the same households as the homemakers. An overall index of degree of kinship interaction was developed.[7]

---

[7] The construction of this index is delineated in [illegible] Dietrich, 1973.

Interaction with kin versus nonkin varied inversely with the size of place of residence (Table 32). Kinship interaction of the rural homemakers was strongly skewed toward the high end of the scale. Kinship interaction of the nonmetropolitan urban homemakers was only slightly skewed in the high direction, while the metropolitan homemakers' kinship interaction scores were about evenly distributed over the scale.

TABLE 32

Interaction with Kin, Versus Nonkin
by Place of Residence

Degree of Interaction	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan (N=250)
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=187)	
	Percent		
High	59.6	26.2	19.2
Moderately High	15.4	26.7	21.8
Moderately Low	7.7	26.8	20.3
Low	9.6	18.7	19.9
None	7.7	1.6	18.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	0	2	23
No Relatives within Visiting Distance	0	18	21

Interaction with Neighbors

The black homemakers were asked about their interaction with their neighbors in the following contexts: (1) shopping or doing "other things together"; (2) borrowing things from each other, taking care of each others' children, or doing "other favors for each other";

(3) time spent visiting or chatting with each other. An index of degree of interaction with neighbors was developed.[8]

In general, the metropolitan homemakers interacted less with their neighbors than did the nonmetropolitan homemakers (Table 33). In all places of residence, however, degree of interaction with neighbors was skewed toward the low end of the scale.

TABLE 33

Interaction with Neighbors by Place of Residence

Degree of Interaction	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural (N=52)	Urban (N=207)	(N=293)
	Percent		
High	19.2	15.5	12.6
Moderate	28.9	42.0	25.6
Low	51.9	42.5	61.8
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	0	0	1

Voluntary Group Participation

The black homemakers were asked if they and their spouses (if applicable) regularly attended the following groups: (1) church; (2) groups connected with church, such as ladies aid, men's clubs; (3) P.T.A. or other community groups; (4) lodges, V.F.W. or other similar organizations; (5) recreation groups, such as sports teams,

[8] A detailed description of this index is presented in Dietrich, 1973.

sewing clubs, card groups; and (6) union or other groups connected with their jobs.

The black families of every place of residence were similar in that they tended to confine their voluntary-group participation to church attendance (Table 34). Church was the only group in which a majority of black families of any place of residence showed some participation. About three-fourths or more of the black families, regardless of place of residence, had at least one parent who regularly attended church. Church attendance appeared more frequent among the rural than among the nonmetropolitan urban or metropolitan residents.

TABLE 34

Percentage of Families with at least One Parent Attending Formal Groups Regularly by Place of Residence

Type of Group	Nonmetropolitan		Metropolitan
	Rural	Urban	
	----------Percent----------		
Church	82.6	72.0	73.4
Church-group	28.8	30.4	29.2
Community Group	3.8	15.9	29.5
Lodge	25.0	12.1	8.6
Recreation Group	5.8	14.5	10.3
Job-connected Group	34.6	38.2	16.7

Church-group attendance was similar for all three residence types. However, place of residence differences can be observed with respect to attendance of the other types of voluntary groups. Community group attendance was positively associated with size of place of residence. On the other hand, lodge attendance was inversely associated with size of place of residence, and job-connected group attendance was over

twice as great among the nonmetropolitan rural and urban families as among the metropolitan families. Participation in recreation groups was greatest among the nonmetropolitan urban residents and least among the rural residents; however, even the nonmetropolitan urban residents showed little participation in this group.

Summary of Residence Differences

Considering the indicators of interaction with kin and neighbors, dependence upon "solidary familiars" appeared greater the smaller the size of place of residence. An inverse association was observed between kin versus nonkin interaction and size of place of residence, and the nonmetropolitan homemakers scored higher on the neighboring index than the metropolitan homemakers.

Except for church, voluntary-group attendance was low among all homemakers and husbands, regardless of place of residence. Of the three residence types, the rural residents were most likely to attend church and lodge groups and metropolitan residents were most likely to attend community groups. Nonmetropolitan urban and rural residents were more likely than the metropolitan residents to attend job-connected groups.

VII. ORIENTATIONS TOWARD THE FUTURE: HOMEMAKERS' ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

This section of the report shifts focus from the family to the homemaker, because orientations toward the future are essentially individual phenomena and because such orientations were not obtained for any family member except the homemaker.[9] Although not family traits per se, future orientations have implications for the intra- and intergenerational perpetuation of poverty in families. Therefore, future orientations are significant for studies of family poverty.

The future orientations of the poor most crucial to the culture-of-poverty thesis are those which contribute to their potential for socioeconomic mobility. The culture-of-poverty thesis predicts that these orientations are of such a nature that they inhibit personal achievement of lower-class people and serve to intergenerationally perpetuate the cycle of poverty by inhibiting their children's motivations and commitment to eventual status attainment. Low occupational or educational aspirations are examples of such orientations (Thomas, 1972:51). This final section of findings also includes place of residence preferences and goals, because past evidence of migration studies suggest geographical mobility might improve the socioeconomic conditions of at least nonmetropolitan black families.

---

[9] Again the restriction of respondents to the homemakers was a pragmatic decision of participants in the NC-90 project.

Homemakers' Educational Projections

The large majority of homemakers of every place of residence expressed desires for more education (Table 35). However, a substantially larger percentage of metropolitan than nonmetropolitan homemakers expressed such desires. Of the homemakers who desired more education, only a minority of any place of residence type expected to complete more schooling. A substantially lower percentage of rural than nonmetropolitan urban or metropolitan homemakers expected to get more education.

TABLE 35

Educational Projections of the Black Homemakers by Place of Residence

	Nonmetropolitan		
	Rural	Urban	Metropolitan
% Desiring More Education	75.0	77.3	88.4
% Expecting More Education	20.5	25.5	36.6
	----------Percent----------		
Level of Education Desired:[a]			
Less than High School	2.6	1.9	0.4
High School Graduate	17.9	25.6	12.8
High School + Vocational Training or Jr. College	48.8	27.5	32.8
College Graduate or Graduate School	30.7	45.0	54.0

[a]Excludes homemakers who did not desire to return to school.

The large majority of homemakers who wanted more education aspired to complete some kind of schooling beyond high school (either vocational training, jr. college, or college), regardless of place of residence. From about a third to half of the homemakers desired to graduate from

college or attend graduate school. Level of educational aspiration increased with size of place of residence.

Homemakers' Residence Goals

The black homemakers were asked several questions regarding their place-of-residence goals. First, they were asked about the rural-urban nature of the places they would most desire to live in for the rest of their lives if they could live anywhere they wanted. Specifically, they were asked to choose from the alternatives presented in Table 36. Secondly, they were asked to name the communities they "would most desire to live in." These answers were analyzed in terms of proximity to present residence. Finally, the homemakers were asked if they wanted to move away from their present community, if they really expected to move, and how certain they were of their expectations ("sure," "not very sure," "not sure at all")?

Rural/Urban Nature of Residence Goals. In reference to the first question, there was conspicuously less consensus among the nonmetropolitan urban homemakers than among the rural or metropolitan homemakers (Table 36). In the case of the rural and metropolitan homemakers, their place of residence aspirations were quite similar to their present places of residence. The large majority of the rural homemakers desired to live in a rural area and not near a city. The opposite was true for the metropolitan homemakers: about three-fourths desired to live in a city; over half, in a very large city. Among the town homemakers, over half aspired to live "in a town or village," as they were doing at the time of the survey. However, they usually chose to live near a city. Only

about a fourth desired to live either in a city of any size or, at the other extreme, in the country (farm or nonfarm).

TABLE 36

Homemakers' Aspirations Regarding Rural/Urban Nature of Place of Residence by Current Place of Residence

Residence Aspiration	Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=52)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)
	Percent		
In a City			
Very large city	0.0	4.3	55.1
Middle-sized	3.8	8.7	14.0
Small	3.9	10.1	3.7
Near a City			
In a town or village	5.8	37.7	11.6
In the country but not on a farm	7.7	9.2	7.5
On a farm	1.9	1.0	1.7
Not Near a City			
In a town or village	3.8	15.5	2.0
In the country but not on a farm	38.5	10.6	4.4
On a farm	34.6	2.9	0.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0

Proximity of Aspired Residence to Present Residence. In reference to the second question, the rural residents were most likely and the nonmetropolitan urban residents were least likely to name their present community as the community they would most desire to live in (Table 37). Less than a third of the rural residents named a community other than their own. Of those who did, many named another community in the same county and almost all named communities in the same region of the state (East Texas).

TABLE 37

Proximity of Aspired Residence to Present Residence
by Current Place of Residence

Aspired Residence	Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=51)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=195)	Metropolitan (N=287)
	Percent		
Same Community	68.6	38.5	51.6
Different Community; Same County	15.7	4.1	2.4
Different County; Same Region in Texas	13.7	41.0	11.9
Different Region of Texas	2.0	3.6	2.1
Louisiana	0.0	3.6	4.5
State other than Louisiana Or Texas	0.0	9.2	27.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	1	12	7

In contrast, only slightly over a third of the nonmetropolitan urban residents named their own community as the place where they most wanted to live. Over half of the nonmetropolitan urban residents named a community in a different county. However, the large majority of nonmetropolitan homemakers named a community in the same region of Texas.

About half of the metropolitan residents named the city where they were currently residing (Houston) as the place where they most desired to live. In marked contrast to the pattern among the nonmetropolitan residents, however, the metropolitan residents who named a community different than their own generally named one outside of Texas and neighboring Louisiana.

Projections for Geographical Mobility. In reference to direct questions about projections for actually moving from their present

communities, the rural residents expressed less desires to move, less expectations to move, and were more certain of their expectations than the nonmetropolitan urban or metropolitan residents (Table 38). However, the large majority of homemakers of every type of residence stated that they neither desired nor expected to move, and most were certain of their expectations in this regard. These responses of the nonmetropolitan homemakers, especially, show a more positive orientation toward their present community than their responses to the previous question indicated. That is, while the nonmetropolitan urban homemakers were somewhat dissatisfied with their present community of residence, they did not appear to want to make the effort and, perhaps, sacrifices necessary in order to move from their present community.

TABLE 38

Homemakers' Projections for Geographical Mobility by Place of Residence

	Nonmetropolitan		
	Rural	Urban	Metropolitan
% Desiring to Move from Present Residence	7.7	27.2	28.7
% Expection to Move from Present Residence	5.8	21.8	21.2
% Certain of Residence Expectation	92.3	76.5	69.6

Mothers' Aspirations and Expectations for their Children

All of the black homemakers who had sons or daughters under 18 years of age were asked about their occupational and educational projections for these sons and daughters.

Occupational Aspirations. The mothers were asked to name the kind of jobs they would like their sons and daughters to have as "lifetime" jobs.[10] These occupations were qualitatively categorized as shown in Tables 39 and 40. These categories were then grouped into seven prestige levels, close approximating Hollingshead's occupational status scale.[11] Answers of "proprietor" or "farm owner" were not classified according to prestige level, because of lack of information about the financial worth of the stores or farms that the mothers desired their children to own.

The mothers' occupational aspirations for their children were markedly similar, regardless of place of residence. In every place of residence, occupational aspirations for sons were markedly skewed towards the high end of the occupational status scale (Table 39). About half of the mothers had occupational aspirations for their sons that ranked highest in Hollingshead's scale, and about three-fourths of the mothers chose occupations that ranked first or second on the prestige scale, regardless of the mothers' place of residence. With respect to qualitative occupational distinctions, the majority of the mothers of every place of residence chose professional occupations. The modal response in every place of residence was jobs requiring college plus some sort of graduate schooling (e.g., doctors or lawyers).

---

[10] If the respondent had more than one child of the same sex and named more than one kind of occupation, the occupation with the highest prestige was coded.

[11] The complete Hollingshead's occupational status scale is shown in Bonjean, et al. (1967).

TABLE 39

Homemakers' Occupational Aspirations for their Sons by Place of Residence

Occupation	Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=39)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=154)	Metropolitan (N=205)
	Percent		
HIGH			
I. High Professional (college +)	46.0	44.2	47.8
Business Executive or High Government Official	2.6	0.0	1.5
Prestigious Clamour	2.6	4.6	4.9
II. Low Professional (college)	23.1	29.2	20.5
Commissioned Military Officer	0.0	0.6	0.0
Business Manager	0.0	0.0	0.5
III. Semiprofessional	0.0	0.0	1.5
Technician	0.0	0.0	2.9
High Sales	5.1	0.6	0.5
High Clerical	0.0	0.0	0.5
IV. Low Clerical	0.0	2.6	0.5
Low Sales	0.0	0.0	1.0
V. Foremen, exciuding farm	0.0	1.4	0.0
Craftsmen	15.4	8.4	5.8
High Service	2.6	3.9	4.4
VI. Semiskilled	0.0	1.3	3.9
VII. Unskilled Laborer	0.0	1.3	1.4
LOW			
Proprietor	0.0	1.9	1.9
Farm Owner	2.6	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Preference	6	20	33
No Sons Under 18	7	33	56

The black mothers' occupational aspirations for their daughters were markedly lower than their aspirations for their sons, regardless of place of residence. Nevertheless, the mothers aspirations for their daughters were of substantially higher prestige than the occupations of the mothers, themselves. About a third of the mothers of every place of residence chose professional occupations which required a college degree for their daughters and another third chose semi-professional occupations (Table 40). These occupational categories ranked two and three on Hollingshead's scale.

TABLE 40

Homemakers' Occupational Aspirations for their Daughters by Place of Residence

Occupation		Nonmetropolitan Rural (N=39)	Nonmetropolitan Urban (N=157)	Metropolitan (N=227)
		Percent		
HIGH				
I.	High Professional (college +)	0.0	5.1	5.7
	Prestigious Glamour	2.6	3.2	3.5
II.	Low Professional (college)	35.9	38.2	32.6
	Business Manager	0.0	0.6	0.4
III.	Semiprofessional	38.5	34.4	36.1
	Technician	0.0	0.0	1.8
	High Clerical	0.0	0.6	2.7
IV.	Low Clerical	12.8	12.1	13.7
V.	Craftsmen	0.0	1.3	0.0
	High Service	7.7	2.6	3.1
VI.	Low Service	0.0	1.3	0.4
	Private Household Worker	2.5	0.0	0.0
	Unskilled Laborer	0.0	0.6	0.0
LOW	TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Preference		6	14	16
No Daughters Under 18		7	36	51

Educational Aspirations and Expectations. The homemakers' educational projections for their children were elicited by the following questions:

(1) How much schooling would you most desire your sons and/or daughters to have?

(2) How much schooling do you really think they will be able to get, considering everything?

The homemakers responded by choosing one of these five alternatives: (1) "Quit school before graduating"; (2) "Graduate from high school"; (3) "High school and vocational training"; (4) "Junior college"; and (5) "Graduate from college."

The black mothers' educational aspirations for their children tended to be high in every place of residence, with the large majority

of mothers desiring their sons and daughters to graduate from college (Tables 41 and 42). In addition, the modal expectation (comprising half or more of the expectations) was college graduation, regardless of mothers' place of residence. However, patterned and substantial residence differences in educational projections were observed. The rural and nonmetropolitan urban mothers were much more likely than the metropolitan mothers to express college aspirations for their sons or daughters. In reference to expectations, the rural mothers were much more likely than the nonmetropolitan urban or metropolitan mothers to project college attainment. The discrepancy between the mothers' educational aspirations for their children versus their expectations for them was more substantial for the nonmetropolitan urban mothers than for either the rural or metropolitan mothers.

TABLE 41

Mothers' Educational Aspirations and Expectations for their Sons by Place of Residence

Education	Nonmetropolitan				Metropolitan	
	Rural		Urban			
	Asps. (N=44)	Exps. (N=44)	Asps. (N=172)	Exps. (N=172)	Asps. (N=238)	Exps. (N=238)
	Percent					
Less than High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.4
High School	2.3	15.9	3.0	39.5	10.5	30.4
High School + Vocational Training	2.3	2.3	1.8	3.0	8.4	15.2
Junior College	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.9	1.7
College Graduate	95.4	81.8	95.2	50.9	78.2	52.3
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	1	1	2	2	0	1
No Sons Under 18	7		33		56	

TABLE 42

Mothers' Educational Aspirations and Expectations for their Daughters by Place of Residence

Education	Nonmetropolitan				Metropolitan	
	Rural		Urban			
	Asps. (N=45)	Exps. (N=44)	Asps. (N=178)	Exps. (N=178)	Asps. (N=241)	Exps. (N=239)
	Percent					
Less than High School	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.8
High School	4.5	15.9	1.2	35.8	6.2	21.2
High School + Vocational Training	2.2	2.3	0.6	1.2	5.3	16.3
Junior College	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.9	2.1
College Graduate	93.3	81.8	98.2	58.6	85.6	59.6
- TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	1	2	3	3	2	0
No Daughters Under 18	6		36		51	

Summary of Residence Differences

No consistent pattern of place of residence differences was observed with respect to orientations potentially affecting socioeconomic mobility. Education projections for selves tended to be positively associated with the size of place of residence; therefore, these orientations would seem to have the most inhibitory potential effect on socioeconomic mobility of the rural homemakers and the least inhibitory potential effect on the metropolitan homemakers. In regard to orientations toward place of residence, the rural homemakers seemed the most favorably disposed and the nonmetropolitan urban homemakers, the least favorably disposed toward their present place of residence. If geographical mobility would be helpful to the socioeconomic mobility of these families, the attitudes of the rural homemakers would again seem to have the most

inhibitory potential effect on eventual socioeconomic mobility. In reference to educational projections for their children, however, the implications of place of residence differences in homemakers' attitudes are reversed. The rural homemakers projected the highest educational attainment for their children and the metropolitan homemakers, the lowest.

One might conclude, therefore, that future orientations of the rural homemakers appeared the most positive, compared to those of the other homemakers, with respect to potential effects on intergenerational mobility. On the other hand, future orientations of the rural homemakers appeared to be the most negative, compared to those of the other homemakers, with respect to potential effects on their own mobility. In general, future orientations of the metropolitan homemakers would appear to have the most favorable potential effect on socioeconomic mobility of the homemakers, themselves.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to determine if residence differences existed with respect to factors purportedly associated with poverty among black families of comparably low socioeconomic status. The purposive sampling procedures employed in the study yielded metropolitan families that were among the least adapted of metropolitan blacks--those metropolitan blacks least able to cope with the exigencies of metropolitan life. Included in the metropolitan sample were nonmigrants as well as rural-to-urban migrants. The nonmetropolitan urban and rural families, on the other hand, were of the nonmigrant residual--the black population remaining in nonmetropolitan areas after selective migration of the better educated of their ranks.

The nature of the sampling procedure, therefore, probably accounted for the lower incomes and less regularity of incomes of the metropolitan compared with the nonmetropolitan black families, as this is the reverse of the situation the Census reports to exist among black families in the United States generally. Nevertheless, in terms of subjective economic indicators and when number of earners per family were taken into account, the metropolitan families appeared to be the economically better-off of the three residence groups. Furthermore, the nonmetropolitan urban families appeared worse off than any of the others when financial problems were considered. Further research is needed to determine if these place of residence differences in economic indicators other than income were sample specific or characteristic of black families elsewhere. In any event, the findings of this study demonstrate the insufficiency of income

as a sole indicator of economic circumstances. In addition, the findings demonstrate that, regardless of economic variation within lower-class groups, the families were economically comparable in the sense that the bulk of families of every place of residence type were in or near poverty.

Residence differences with respect to sources of income and nonmonetary help were what one might expect among nonmetropolitan and metropolitan families elsewhere. nonmetropolitan families relied more on earned incomes, nonmonetary help from kin and producing their own food and clothes. However, the greater dependence of nonmetropolitan urban than metropolitan families on earned as opposed to unearned sources of income may largely be due to greater numbers of metropolitan than nonmetropolitan urban father-absent families and not necessarily to metropolitan residents' greater access to welfare benefits.

With respect to indicators of articulation with opportunity structures, the only ones which might have accounted for the place of residence differences in income were higher unemployment of metropolitan than nonmetropolitan urban husbands and wives. The metropolitan husbands and wives appeared better prepared educationally to meet job prerequisites, but this advantage was not reflected in the prestige-rank of the blacks' occupations. This suggests another hypothesis for future research: attainment of a high school diploma has little influence on occupational attainment for a large proportion of metropolitan and nonmetropolitan blacks.

In regard to the family indicators, none of the samples reflected the weak and aberrant family structures emphasized by Moynihan and his followers, except that a large number of one-parent families were observed in each sample. The one-parent families were more prevalent in the metropolitan than nonmetropolitan samples. The metropolitan families also appeared generally weaker than the nonmetropolitan urban or rural families with respect to the variables of fathers' authority and participation in the families, wives' marital satisfaction, and family cohesiveness.

The nonmetropolitan families, on the other hand, were more likely than the metropolitan families to be extended, to be larger in terms of total number of family dependents and number of children, and to exhibit nonpermissive child-rearing orientations. To the extent to which these characteristics are causally associated with poverty, the nonmetropolitan families appear weaker in these respects than the metropolitan families. Such causal associations, however, are still theoretical and not yet established fact.

The findings of the study with respect to social interaction indicate that the metropolitan parents were handicapped less by dependence on solidary familiars than the nonmetropolitan urban and, especially, rural parents--if such dependence on solidary familiars is, in fact, more of a handicap than functional. In regard to types of group participation,

the metropolitan parents might be more organizable in terms of solving community-related problems, because they were more likely than nonmetropolitan parents to attend community groups. The nonmetropolitan parents, on the other hand, appeared more organizable in terms of trying to improve their job situations, because they were more likely than metropolitan parents to attend job-connected groups, such as unions. This latter finding, however, is likely to be due to the particular nature of the jobs of the nonmetropolitan versus metropolitan residents and, thus, sample specific.

Place of residence differences were also observed in attitudes and aspirations potentially affecting socioeconomic mobility of the homemakers. These future orientations appeared most favorable to the homemakers own potential socioeconomic mobility in the metropolitan sample; least favorable to their own mobility in the rural sample. Just about the opposite pattern of residence differences was found with respect to the homemakers' aspirations for their childrens' mobility.

In conclusion, the findings of this study suggest that stable and healthy family relationships, as reflected by the variables of father-absence, the husband-father role in the family, family cohesiveness and marital satisfaction may be more difficult to maintain by poor blacks of metropolitan ghettos than nonmetropolitan areas. On the other hand, future orientations appear more prohibitive of intragenerational mobility among nonmetropolitan than metropolitan poor blacks. In addition, nonmetropolitan poor blacks might be more handicapped than metropolitan poor blacks by demands of kin relationships, larger families, the nature of their child-rearing practices, and their goals for their

children. Whether or not these residence differences exist among metropolitan and nonmetropolitan blacks in general seems a fruitful topic for future research.

APPENDIXES

A. Description of the Study Areas

B. Description of the Samples

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

TABLE A-1. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Texas and the Study Area: 1970[a]

Characteristics	Texas	Study Area[b]		
		County	Town	Metropolitan
Percent black	12.5	24.4	30.3	99.1
Age: % under 18	35.7	32.1	32.7	34.1
for blacks only	41.8	43.6	44.0	40.4
% 18-64	55.4	51.0	50.2	50.5
for blacks only	50.2	44.4	45.6	50.1
% 65 and over	8.9	16.9	17.1	9.7
for blacks only	8.0	12.0	10.4	9.6
Dependency Ratio[c]	80.5	96.2	99.2	86.7
for blacks only	99.3	125.1	119.4	99.7
Sex Ratio[d]	95.9	90.9	82.5	87.4
for blacks only	92.7	91.0	86.0	86.9
Fertility Ratio[e]	368	375	410	400
for blacks only	455	559	548	403
% Husband-Wife Families	87.4	86.1	81.5	60.2
for blacks only	71.5	71.9	66.9	44.3
Mean No. Persons/Household	3.2	2.9	2.8	3.2
for blacks only	3.5	3.6	3.4	3.2

[a]Statistics for Texas, County and Town were provided by Dr. W. Kennedy Upham, formerly at Texas A&M University, and the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1971.

[b]Population statistics were not available for the villages. Statistics for the metropolitan sample are based upon U.S. Bureau of the Census figures for Houston census tract 201, which most closely corresponded to the study area.

[c]The number of persons under 18 and over 64 years of age per 100 persons 18 through 64 years of age.

[d]Number of males per 100 females.

[e]Number of children under 5 years of age per 1000 women 15 to 49 years of age. Metropolitan statistic computed for 1000 women 15 to 54 years of age.

TABLE A-2. Selected Socioeconomic Characteristics of Texas and the Study Area: 1970[a]

Characteristics[b]	Texas	Study Area[c]		
		County	Town	Metropolitan
Median Family Income	$8,490	$5,221	$5,624	$4,882
for blacks only	5,334	3,988	4,617	4,846
Mean Family Income	9,955	6,485	8,241	5,729
for blacks only	6,118	4,356	4,804	-----[d]
% Families with Wage or Salary Income	86.8	75.9	82.8	89.6
for blacks only	88.6	80.7	89.8	-----[d]
Mean Family Income from Salary or Wages	9,002	5,853	6,358	5,514
for blacks only	5,989	4,250	4,611	-----[d]
% Families with Income from Public Assistance	5.0	11.5	10.6	13.16
for blacks only	13.0	21.4	20.5	22.9
% Families in Poverty[e]	14.6	26.8	23.6	35.3
for blacks only	32.7	48.6[f]	41.6	35.6
Median Years of School Completed[g]	11.6	9.7	10.4	9.0
Males	11.7	9.0	9.8	-----[h]
Females	11.6	10.1	10.7	-----[h]
for blacks only	9.8	-----[h]	-----[h]	9.0
Males	9.3	7.0	8.3	-----[h]
Females	10.0	8.5	8.8	-----[h]
% High School Graduates[g]	47.4	29.6	36.1	22.9
Males	48.0	28.1	33.3	-----[h]
Females	46.9	30.9	38.2	-----[h]
for blacks only	-----[h]	-----[h]	-----[h]	23.0
Males	28.7	14.3	18.7	-----[h]
Females	31.3	21.8	21.7	-----[h]
% Males Unemployed[i]	4.9	11.1	1.4	3.6
for blacks only	9.1	9.6	1.8	3.7

[a]Statistics for Texas, County and Town provided by Dr. W. Kennedy Upham, formerly at Texas A&M University and the U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1971.

[b]Definitions of many of the following characteristics can be found in U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970.

[c]No data available for villages. Statistics for the metropolitan sample are based upon U.S. Bureau of the Census figures for the Houston census tract most closely corresponding to the study area.

[d]Metropolitan study area was 99% black so figures "for blacks only" are essentially the same as those for the entire metropolitan study area.

[e]Poverty level is derived from the poverty index previously defined.

TABLE A-2 (cont'd.)

[f]These figures have not been corrected for a Census error over-estimating the number of farm families; thus, they may understate the percentage of families at these poverty levels.

[g]By or of persons 25 years of age and over.

[h]No data available

[i]Males between 16 and 65 years of age who are not in school or inmates of institutions.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES

TABLE B-1. Ages of the Homemakers and Husbands

Age	Homemakers			Husbands		
	Rural (N=52)	NM Urban (N=205)	Metropolitan (N=294)	Rural (N=32)	NM Urban (N=146)	Metropolitan (N=132)
	Percent					
20 or less	1.9	5.8	4.1	0.0	2.0	2.3
21-29	13.5	23.4	24.0	9.3	27.4	24.4
30-39	26.9	35.1	31.3	34.4	26.7	19.9
40-49	42.3	17.6	26.5	12.5	18.5	30.5
50-64	15.4	18.1	14.1	34.4	24.0	17.6
65 or more	----	----	----	9.4	1.4	5.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
No Information	0	2	3	1	0	1
Range	20-64	16-62	17-64	22-75	18-84	19-80
Median	41	36	40	45	36	41

TABLE B-2. Mean Ages of Children in the Families

Mean Age	Rural (N=52)	NM Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)
	Percent		
5 years or less	15.4	24.2	25.8
6-10 years	42.4	43.0	33.0
11-15 years	36.4	29.0	36.4
16-17 years	5.8	3.8	4.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean	9.3	8.3	8.7
Median	8.8	8.5	9.3

TABLE B-3. Birthplaces of the Homemakers and Husbands

Birthplace	Homemakers			Husbands		
	Rural (N=52)	NM Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=294)	Rural (N=33)	NM Urban (N=144)	Metropolitan (N=130)
	Percent					
Locally (within 50 miles of present home)	90.4	86.5	26.8	97.0	87.5	23.8
Texas, but not locally	7.7	8.2	40.5	0.0	5.6	39.2
In the South but not Texas	1.9	4.3	32.0	3.0	6.2	36.2
Other Region of the U.S.	0.0	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE B-4. Portions of Homemakers' and Husbands' Lives Spent in Rural Areas

Portion of Life	Homemakers			Husbands		
	Rural (N=52)	NM Urban (N=207)	Metropolitan (N=293)	Rural (N=33)	NM Urban (N=144)	Metropolitan (N=129)
	Percent					
None	0.0	35.3	43.7	0.0	36.0	27.1
Less than Half	3.8	26.1	30.0	3.0	19.5	38.0
Over Half	57.7	36.2	26.3	45.5	43.8	34.9
All	38.5	2.4	----	57.5	0.7	----
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE B-5. Number of Times the Family Moved in the Past Five Years.

Number of Moves	Rural (N=46)	NM Urban (N=168)	Metropolitan (N=245)
	----------Percent----------		
0	65.2	48.2	49.0
1	26.1	33.3	24.5
2	4.4	13.1	14.3
3	4.3	4.2	6.5
4	0.0	0.0	4.1
5 or more	0.0	1.2	1.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Family Not Formed Five Years Ago	6	39	49

REFERENCES

Beale, Calvin L.
1971 "Rural-Urban Migration of Blacks: Past and Future." American Journal of Agricultural Economics 53 (May):302-307.

Bonjean, Charles M.
1967 Sociological Measurement: An Inventory of Scales and Indices. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Clark, Kenneth B.
1965 Dark Ghetto: Dilemmas of Social Power. New York: Harper and Row.

Cleland, Charles
1963 "Two Indices for Rural Households Dependency and Capability to Work." Revision of a paper presented at the Southern Sociological Society annual meeting, Durham, North Carolina.

Cohen, Albert K., and Harold M. Hodges, Jr.
1963 "Characteristics of the Lower-Blue-Collar Class." Social Problems 10 (Spring):303-334.

Cromwell, Ronald E.
1968 Development of a Parental Attitude Research Scale for Use with Middle and Lower-Class Families. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kansas State University.

Dietrich, Katheryn Thomas
1973 Black Families in a Nonmetropolitan Southern County: Social, Economic, and Psychological Attributes. Departmental Information Report 73-10. College Station: Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Texas A&M University.

Frazier, E. Franklin
1939 The Negro Family in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Greenfield, Sidney M.
1966 English Rustics in Black Skin. New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press.

Hill, Robert
1971 The Strength of Black Families. New York: Emerson Hall Publishers.

Iowa Agricultural & Home Economics Experiment Station
1974 Patterns of Living Related to Income Poverty in Disadvantaged Families: A Basebook. North Central Regional Research Publication No. 217. Ames: Iowa State University.

Liebow, Elliot
1966 Tally's Corner. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

McCord, William, John Howard, Bernard Friedberg and Edwin Harwood
1969 Life Styles in the Black Ghetto. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Moynihan, Daniel P.
1965 The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. Office of Policy Planning and Research. United States Department of Labor.

Rainwater, Lee
1970 Behind Ghetto Walls: Negro Families in a Federal Slum. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Scanzoni, John H.
1970 Opportunity and The Family. New York: The Free Press.

1971 The Black Family in Modern Society. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Seeman, Melvin
1959 "On the Meaning of Alienation." American Sociological Review 24 (December):783-791.

Staples, Robert
1971 The Black Family. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Taeuber, Karl E., and Alma F. Taeuber
1965 "The Changing Character of Negro Migration." The American Journal of Sociology 70 (January):429-441.

Thomas, George
1972 Poverty in the Nonmetropolitan South: A Causal Analysis. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

U.S. Bureau of The Census
1970 1970 Census Users Guide. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1971 Census of the Population: 1970. General Population Characteristics, Final Report PC(1)-B45, Texas. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

LISTING OF H-2906 REPORTS

Texas Agricultural Experiment Station
Texas A&M University

Dietrich, Katheryn T. "A Re-Examination of the Myth of Black Matriarchy." Forthcoming in Journal of Marriage and the Family, May, 1975.

Kutner, Nancy G. An Interethnic and Place of Residence Examination of the "Culture of Poverty." Departmental Technical Report 75-1, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, 1975.

Kutner, Nancy G. "Differential Adaptation Among Lower-Lower Black Homemakers in a Rural-Urban Community." Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1974.

Dietrich, Katheryn T. "Elements of Socialization Impeding or Facilitating Goal-Striving in the Lower-Class Black Family." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rocky Mountain Social Science Association, El Paso, April, 1974.

Dietrich, Katheryn T. "External Influences on the Marital Relationships of Low-Income Blacks." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas, March, 1974.

Dietrich, Katheryn T. "Relevance of the Culture-of-Poverty Notion for a Sample of Low-Income Nonmetropolitan Southern Blacks." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Texas Academy of Science, Denton, March, 1974.

Dietrich, Katheryn T. and Lee Greiser. "The Influence of Sex on Wage-Incomes of Black, Blue-Collar Workers in Selected Nonmetropolitan and Metropolitan Areas of Texas." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, Memphis, February, 1974.

Kutner, Nancy G. "The Poor Vs. the Non-Poor: An Ethnic and Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan Comparison." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, August, 1974.

Dietrich, Katheryn T. Black Families in a Nonmetropolitan Southern County: Social, Economic, and Psychological Attributes. Departmental Information Report 73-10, Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, 1973.

Warren, Richard, William Kuvlesky, and George Ragland. "Relationship of Selected Factors to Race Relation Orientations of Southern Blacks: A Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan Comparison of Texas Homemakers." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, College Park, Maryland, August, 1973.

Sell, Jane Ann. "The Relationship Between Black Mothers' Attitudes Toward Sex Roles and Their Educational Aspirations and Expectations for Their Daughters." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, College Park, Maryland, August, 1973.

Kuvlesky, William P., Jane Sell, and Katheryn Dietrich. "Aspirations of Rural Black Women and Their Orientations Toward Migration." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas, March, 1973.

Dietrich, Katheryn T. "Determinants of Family Power Among Low-Income Southern Blacks." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southwestern Sociological Association, Dallas, March, 1973.

Copeland, E. Leonard and W. Kennedy Upham. "Residential Migrations and Aspirations of Black Homemakers: A Comparison of Country, Town, and Metropolitan Residents in East Texas." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Atlanta, February, 1973.

Dietrich, Katheryn and William P. Kuvlesky. "Changes in the Attitudes Toward Race Relations of Southern Rural Blacks: Analysis of a Panel of Village Women, 1970-1972." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Atlanta, February, 1973.

Kuvlesky, William P., Richard Warren, and George Ragland. "Orientations Toward Racial Prejudice Among Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Blacks." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Baton Rouge, August, 1972.

Kutner, Nancy G. "Further Examination of the Coracialism Hypothesis: Voluntary Associations Among Blacks in a Texas Small Town and Metropolis." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Society, New Orleans, August, 1972.

Kuvlesky, William P. and Earl Taft. "Problems and Hang-ups in the Study of Racial Prejudice: Conceptual Ambiguities and Empirical Gaps." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Texas Academy of Science, San Marcos, March, 1972.

Kuvlesky, William P., and Katheryn Thomas Dietri . "A Longitudinal Study of Blacks' Perceptions of Race Relations: A Study of Village Blacks in a Southern Area." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Richmond, Virginia, February, 1972.

Kuvlesky, William P., and Margaret Cannon. "Perceptions of Racial Prejudice Among Rural and Small Town Blacks in a Southern County." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Denver, August, 1971.

Kutner, Nancy G. "The Low-Income Joiner: Aspects of Intra-Class Variation in Voluntary Association Involvement." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Southern Sociological Society, Atlanta, April, 1970.

Kutner, Nancy G. "Some Perspectives on the Role of Voluntary Associations Among Low-Income Groups." Paper presented at the annual Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Conference, College Station, Texas, January, 1970.

Kutner, Nancy G. Voluntary Association Involvement Among Rural and Urban Low-Income People: Annotations of the Research Literature. Departmental Information Report No. 69-3. College Station, Texas: Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Texas A&M University, 1969.

Theses

Sell, Jane A. Elements of Sex-Role Perpetuation in Attitudes of Mothers: A Study of Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Black Homemakers in East Texas. Unpublished Master's of Science Thesis, Texas A&M University, 1974.

Taft, Earl A. Relationships Between Family Disability and Family Interaction Patterns: A Metropolitan-Nonmetropolitan Comparison of Southern Black Families. Unpublished Master's of Science thesis, Texas A&M University, 1973.

Collaborative Effort of All State Participants in the NC-90 Project

Patterns of Living in Disadvantaged Families Related to Income Poverty: A Basebook. North Central Regional Research Publication. Ames, Iowa: Iowa Agricultural and Home Economics Experiment Station, 1974.